PREFACE

I THINK it is useful and necessary to explain at once the particular point of view from which I describe in this study the life of a community of Greek Sarakatsan shepherds. I begin with an analysis, in some detail, of kinship institutions and the structure of the family, which emphasizes how an individual's moral obligations are concentrated almost exclusively within family and kindred at the expense of his relations with people outside that relatively limited circle. Families not connected by kinship or marriage are related through institutions of mutual hostility and competition; and unrelated persons view one another at all times with intense distrust. A system of social values based on concepts of honour, strength, and pride is associated with these institutions and attitudes, and together they guide the conduct of Sarakatsani in the apparent anarchy of their communal life. Inevitably these institutions and values severely limit the possible forms of economic and civic co-operation. Further, they considerably affect the character of the relations between this community of mutually opposed family commonwealths and the rest of Greek society. Given a centralized administration, and parliamentary government with a universal franchise, an implication of the internal structure of the community is that these relations tend to take certain forms of political and social patronage. Honour, Family, and Patronage represent a pattern of interrelated institutions and values. 121 577 602 609 182

In this book I have attempted to abstract for the purposes of analysis a particular complex of institutions and values which are not peculiar to the Sarakatsani. Very similar formal elements are critical for the study of society anywhere in the Greek provinces, and even, in many respects, in the cities. Moreover, the social forms which are described here have many interesting parallels in other parts of the Mediterranean world, and it is principally as a contribution to the study of social structures in this area that I offer my study. 121 171

S 619 829 [621] [648] It is believed by the Sarakatsani that the interests of unrelated families are opposed and, indeed, mutually destructive. The local gathering of families which in summer happen to graze the pastures and enjoy citizenship rights of the same village, has little cohesion as a group except when on a rare occasion, such as a village festival, it breaks into brief and violent opposition to the villagers; and it has no organization beyond the ephemeral political combinations which appear at the time of local village elections. The idea of the total community is, of course, important; it represents a way of life in opposition to the ways of peasants, merchants, and bureaucrats. But the community, too, lacks any structure of authority or effective organization; and, in part, for the same reasons, that is to say the solidarity, exclusiveness, and mutual opposition of the families which form it.

S 619 577 ● While it is true that the total community (or the local gathering of families as a segment of it) is not an organized social group, it nevertheless defines a social space within which values are shared and the conduct of men and women is evaluated by other Sarakatsani. These values concern, especially, right ways of acting in family and kinship roles and the sex-linked moral characteristics which a man or woman ought to exhibit when he, or she, stands forward as the protagonist of the family and the guardian of its honour. Such evaluations imply a hierarchy of prestige. And it is precisely through mutual competition in terms of strength, wealth, and a reputation for honour, that the opposed families, and groups of related families, are associated with one another in a coherent and regular manner.

S G 133 [121] To these general features of the community it is necessary to add a brief consideration of particular geographical and historical factors which help to explain the presence of the Sarakatsani in the Zagori. Geographically Zagori is the western flank of the Pindus range immediately north of the approaches to the Metsovo pass, which forms its southern boundary; the mountain Mitsikeli is its western limit, and the sweep of the river Aóös contains it from the east and the north. The ridges of the Pindus, which effectively separate the eastern and western coastal plains of continental Greece, run in a north-west to south-east direction. The vast pressures which created these folds came from the east so that the escarpments present extremely abrupt

233 one another on terms of hostility and reciprocal trespass. Yet
474 even then, if we consider the community as a whole, the direc-
571 tions in which the shepherds of one stani may show active
578 aggression are limited, as also are the form and degree of its expression, simply because a shepherd cannot leave his sheep. And this also makes it possible for unrelated shepherds to feel, but not very often to express, an intensity of hostility for one another that would otherwise reduce a vulnerable community of shepherds to a condition of anarchy if confrontations were more numerous than, in fact, they are.

2. THE SHEPHERDS

825 For the Sarakatsani, sheep and goats, men and women, are
828 important and related oppositions with a moral reference. Sheep are peculiarly God's animals, and their shepherds, made in His image, are essentially noble beings. Women through the particular sensuality of their natures are inherently more likely to have relations with the Devil; and goats were originally the animals of the Devil which Christ captured and tamed for the service of man. It is consistent with these ideas that sheep and shepherds in their respective animal and human worlds display ideal moral characteristics. Sheep are docile, enduring, pure, and intelligent. When the shepherd carries out a small veterin-
ary operation or when the ewe gives birth, the animal suffers
[577] in silence. To match this purity and passive courage shepherds
ought to be fearless and devoted guardians, and clean in the
[834] ritual sense. After sexual intercourse a shepherd must carefully
[234] wash his hands before milking sheep and it is generally prefer-
able that the two shepherds of the flock of milking ewes should
be unmarried men.

233 Whether or not shepherds require quite the degree of courage
461 that the values of the community insist they do, is open to doubt.
[577] Perhaps devotion, endurance, and a head for heights, would be
a more objective assessment. Two experienced shepherds, preferably men between twenty-five and thirty years of age, guard the pregnant or milking ewes. Another young and active shepherd follows the flock of last season's lambs, the 'zigouria'. One or two older but not necessarily intelligent men watch the rams and sterile ewes, the 'sterpha'. Young shepherds before their military service often serve their apprenticeship with the

a road which is often congested with the flocks of other stanis. 233
In the dark and on ground he does not know the shepherd must 221
try to graze his sheep where he can, prevent them from mixing 461
with the animals of other flocks, and guard them from village [685]
or Sarakatsan thieves for whom the conditions are an opportunity
and a temptation. At dawn they try to find some grass, 233
and here the mule-train (χαραβάνι) with the older men, women, 234
and children, overtakes them to prepare a temporary milking- 221
pen. After the animals have been milked the women at once 461
begin to turn the milk into cheese, and later to bake bread. [492]
Meanwhile the shepherds graze the sheep until about 11 a.m.
when the animals lie down to rest in the heat of the day. They
are milked again in the evening before setting out on the next
leg of their journey. But the women remain to make the cheese
for the second time in the day, and to take a few hours of sleep
before they move swiftly through the night to overtake the
sheep once again. After a journey of perhaps ten days they
finally reach their homeland, the high mountains of Zagori.

In the mountains shepherding practice changes. The sheep 233
graze at night in the cool air when their appetite is stronger. 234
At dawn the animals are watered and about 9 o'clock they are 461
milked. They then 'sleep in the shade' (σταλίζουν) until the late
afternoon when they are milked again before setting out to
graze in the fresh evening air. About once in every eight days 233
salt is spread on flat stones. They eat this greedily and are 461
watered immediately afterwards, a treatment which increases
their will to graze in the summer heat, and is believed to
strengthen them for successful mating.

The quality of physical courage, on which the Sarakatsani [577] ●
put so much emphasis in their list of the ideal attributes of the
shepherd, is perhaps more necessary in summer than winter.
Moving along, or over, the broken limestone ridges in the darkness
from one plateau of grass to another requires a very sure
foot and steady nerves. Sheep sometimes get into difficulties and
have to be rescued. If an animal falls into a crevasse and breaks
a leg it must be extricated, the limb bound and splinted, and
the animal carried down the mountain to the village.

Immediately before or after the migration to summer pastures, 233
the animals are shorn. Already at the end of March some 236
wool has been taken from their legs and haunches but the full 461

233 236 461 shearing is delayed until the warmer weather. Shearing, too, marks the passing of the winter and is considered a festival. On the final day there is meat, wine, and dancing. Like the journey from the plains it is also hard work for the shepherd, giving him, however, an opportunity to prove his expertise and strength. In a highly competitive atmosphere before the appraising eyes of each other and the women, the men of the stani gather in the sheep-fold to clip the fleeces of the different flocks. A strong and skilful man may shear sixty animals in a day.

233 461 The cycle of shepherding activities continues with the mating season in June or July, the date depending on the condition of [234] the animals. Then, in the last days of July, the cheese merchant closes his station and gradually with the reduced flow of milk from the pregnant ewes the shepherds milk their animals less frequently until, some time in the first half of August, lactation ceases. At length the shepherds pause and rest.

When the shepherds arrive in the mountains their mood changes almost abruptly from an expectation of the worst to guarded optimism. Since the autumn they have suffered anxiety, crisis, and frequently physical exhaustion in their efforts to avoid disaster to the lambs, a small milk yield, or disease. These dangers do not exist, or are less considerable, in [578] the summer. At this season the systematic practice of reciprocal grass theft, the sometimes accidental trespass, the intermingling of two flocks when they converge on the cheese-maker's station at milking time, are all situations which may precipitate quarrels with unrelated shepherds that threaten life and honour, but they are not possibilities that cause the shepherd much apprehensive concern. In personal oppositions he is confident in his own strength and courage, he depends on nothing outside himself. On the other hand, whatever skill a shepherd may possess, the dangers which threaten the flock in winter often depend on factors or elements beyond his individual control. [735] Yet extreme poverty, which is a possible consequence of such a disaster, destroys honour and sometimes takes the lives of small children.

233 825 The Sarakatsan shepherd identifies himself with his animals. Their condition is almost as personal a concern as his own health and appearance. If a sheep is stoned by another man, [572] the shepherd's honour is touched.

The Sarakatsan family is not only a domestic association of 59
individuals with mutual affections based on blood relationship, [421]
it is a corporate group owning in common all significant property; and of this the leader, whether father or brother, is the trustee not the owner. Economically it struggles to become a self-sufficient unit with a division of labour organized about the service of its flocks; politically its members invariably act together. The individual in his work and behaviour is entirely [181]
committed to his family, whose prestige and reputation for honour are his foremost concern.

The family is also a religious community with its own 'sacra', 59
icons, and other objects. In the popular mind it is an earthly 771
reflection of the Heavenly Family of God the Father, the Mother of God, and Christ. Relations between members of a family ought to be modelled on the attitudes which, it is imagined, inspire the relations of the Heavenly archetype Family and its members. A father ought to have wisdom and foresight, a [577]
mother compassion, a son courage and respect, a daughter virginity, and so on.[3] Through grace, which descends in the sacrament of the Eucharist and through the icons, and in other ways, they are helped to achieve these modes of being, and in achieving them they partake, in a sense, of the condition of the Holy Family and are therefore less vulnerable as a group to material disaster or the spiritual attacks of the Devil. Through reference to a divine model, a man or woman in family life participates in a reality that transcends individuality; the harsh and ceaseless struggle to survive, even simple and often repeated actions such as carrying water or milking sheep, come to possess a validity which is absolute and intrinsic.

---

of the joint household by his married sons. Yet so long as it does last, th 59
family group has in other respects a corporate jural existence and person 612
ality. Cf. Sir Henry Maine, *The Early History of Institutions*, London, 1893, [113]
p. 78.

The Sarakatsan family is a system of closed relationships and a group with a recognized leader. It holds all property in common and controls the productive powers of all its members and the reproductive capacities of its women. In principle all its members are held to be responsible for the action of any other member. It is with regard to these characteristics that I describe this group as 'corporate'.

[3] In the different aspects of her person, the Mother of God provides a model for both the mother and the daughter in the earthly family.

Zagori

slaughter, the intrigues of others with merchants and officials, 612
which often vitally affect his own affairs, the ever pressing problem 203
of where winter pasture is to be found, this is the kind of
information a man exchanges with his kinsman or, more rarely,
with a close and trusted affine.

Kinsmen are indispensable in the delicate negotiations of 612
'match-making'. Before a girl is sought in marriage, very careful 584
inquiries have to be made concerning her virtue, industry,
health, and temperament. A kinsman who lives near the girl's
family will be in a position to give accurate details; his information
will be trusted, and he will treat the affair with the discretion
it demands. For marriage involves a contract between [581]
two hostile groups, and offence, given or received by either [578]
side, is a question of honour and may lead to violence and
killing.

I have introduced the notion that the opposed families of 571
this fragmented community are related through competition 577
for prestige. Certainly, it is impossible to miss the competitive
flavour of social life outside the home. Men care passionately
about their prestige, the prestige of their families, and of their
kinsmen. Indeed all these reputations are parts of a single
complex. And in a paradoxical fashion they depend upon the
opinions of enemies. Whenever there is some incident or affray, [203]
the news of it travels with remarkable rapidity to all quarters
of the Zagori. Within a matter of forty-eight hours small
groups of Sarakatsani throughout the area will be passing judgement
on the behaviour of the people involved, as this is evaluated
according to the values of the community. They will
analyse minutely what a man is reported to have said and done,
and they will decide whether he was justified in what he did
and whether he displayed manliness (ἀνδρισμός) in defending
his honour. In such discussions a man's kinsmen will take his 577
side, acting as advocates and apologists for his behaviour. 612
Furthermore, the mere numerical size of a man's kindred is a
matter of prestige, because, other things being equal, it means
that he is a man who will be taken notice of, assisted, and well-informed
wherever he goes. In discussing kinship the Sarakatsani 612
often say, 'Nobody takes account of a man without 829
kinsmen'. They use, in this context, a word, λογαριάζω, which
expresses both the idea of esteeming another man and of

For instance, it often
happens at weddings that quarrels develop between unrelated 612
guests. Insults, curses, and blows are exchanged, and sometimes 578
knives are drawn. These events have a certain pattern. A man 627
is insulted, or imagines that he has been insulted, by another. At once all the relatives of either man range themselves alongside their kinsman; and those who are unrelated to either party, as well as others embarrassed by an equal allegiance to both sides, throw themselves between the two antagonists. But the paternal or maternal origin of relationship neither increases nor diminishes the obligation to support a kinsman in this or any other situation.

Property and prestige are passed from one generation to the 612
next according to customary rules of inheritance in the one 554
case, and canons of popular judgement in the other, which reflect 577
the symmetry of an individual's relations to the families of origin of his father and mother. Property is itself an element in prestige, while wealth without prestige loses its significance. Individual and family reputation, as I have already indicated, is a self-evident value; without it social life has no meaning. This prestige is inherited both from the father's family and the mother's. It is true that the prestige of paternal connexions is greater; but the quality of the mother's family of origin is also critical, for criticism of the mother, who contributes important moral qualities to the characters of her children, is a peculiarly effective method of denigrating a family. The individual, of course, may increase or diminish his reputation by his own acts but it is on the basis of a reputation inherited from both parents that he at first faces the judgements of the community. And if this inherited reputation is unsatisfactory, it will be exceedingly
difficult for the individual by his own efforts to redeem it. It is 584
partly for these reasons that the choice of a wife is a matter 554
which is approached with delicacy and deliberation. Many personal 577
qualities of a prospective bride are taken into consideration 612
but invariably the crucial question to be debated is the quality and prestige of the girl's family and close kin. The Sarakatsani use a Turkish word, νταμάρι, of which the primary meaning is a vein, to indicate the general quality of a man's immediate maternal and paternal ancestors.[7] And if either the

---

[7] The more general meaning of νταμάρι in modern Greek is 'stone quarry'.

584 bride or the bridegroom is from a family of lower prestige than
554 the other, it is said that he (or she) 'destroys' the νταμάρι of the
577 other partner. For it is thought that in the family which results
612 from a marriage both partners have contributed their blood 'to
make one blood' which is unique and on whose purity the prestige and honour of the new family depends.

59 In a similar manner both husband and wife contribute
583 wealth to the elementary family which they establish. The
425 corporate property of a family is a common stock of animals,
money, and goods, from which sons and daughters must be
[422] endowed. Daughters receive their portion as dowry at the moment of marriage, but the married sons normally continue to live in an extended family group where family wealth is still held in common. In the eventual partition of this joint household and its property, which is delayed until all the daughters have been married, and generally occurs five to ten years after the marriage of the eldest son, equal shares of stock and other assets are received by each son; but in the case of the youngest son an extra half-share is provided for the maintenance of each surviving parent who by custom remains in the household of this son. When an elementary family leaves the joint household of married brothers, the husband's family has probably contributed about 100 sheep and goats and one or two mules while the wife's family has supplied in the form of her dowry (προικιό) the furnishings of the hut and sufficient clothes and finery for the bride to wear or display for a period of ten years or more.
[435] The value of such a dowry is about £150, or the equivalent of 50 sheep. Since 1945, however, the practice has grown up of
[198] demanding from the bride's family about forty sheep or their equivalent in gold sovereigns in addition to the traditional dowry. Thus approximately under the traditional convention, and more rigorously today, there exists a certain balance between the wealth that passes into a new family from the husband's family of origin and that which is contributed by the wife's family of origin. It would be wrong to think of the dowry merely as a payment made by a bride's family to obtain a husband for her. Certainly there have been cases where girls who had physical or moral deficiencies have had to pay large dowries to get any kind of husband at all. It is also true that calculations of family prestige are concerned in the size of the

585 gives his wife some peremptory order. The husband's obligations
593 and affections are still entirely contained within his own
596 family of origin. Indeed his behaviour reflects an almost compulsive
assertion that 'this is how it will always be'. Clearly if
this fiction is to be maintained for even a short space of time,
the husband must not display any affective interest in his bride,
since this would inevitably disturb the equilibrium in the old
[833] pattern of his relations with his siblings and his parents. Therefore
in his general behaviour the husband attempts to deny the
importance of his exclusive sexual relationship with his bride
and he makes every effort to conceal the occurrence and frequency
[513] of sexual intercourse. However, since all the members
of a family sleep together in the same hut, this is not easy.

585 Before the marriage ceremony a temporary hut is built for
833 the bridal pair, or sometimes a space is cleared in the hut which
596 is otherwise used as a store-shed. Customarily the bridegroom
577 does not go with the sheep for eight days from the Sunday of
[342] his marriage and he is thus able to sleep in privacy with his
bride for six nights. Although this initial privacy is granted to him, the whole progress of these marital events is shared by the groom with his brothers; some of this information also leaks through to the female members of the family. In this first sexual communion the entire family identifies itself with the young husband. There is no question at this stage of his having any affection for his bride. This may emerge later partly as a result of the intimacies now initiated. It is something of an ordeal and a matter of considerable anxiety for all Sarakatsan bridegrooms that they should be able to effect a technically successful assault upon this strange woman and uphold their reputation for manliness in its most literal sense, a reputation which affects the prestige of the entire family. The stress on physical and moral manliness (ἀνδρισμός) in the stereotype of the ideal man encourages in the Sarakatsani a deep-seated fear of sexual impotence on this critical occasion which is, indeed, almost a public ceremony of initiation. In the morning, success or failure on the previous night is discussed with brothers in embarrassed monosyllables and, if there has been difficulty, they try to give advice and encouragement. Any lack of sexual prowess almost inevitably reaches the ears of the bride's family and the possibility of a leakage farther afield cannot be overlooked.

585 a cold and draughty part of the hut not favoured by more
833 senior members of the family. The groom arrives at the huts
596 some time after midnight when the family is asleep, slips into the hut, remains with his young wife for an hour or so and then, well before dawn, is already on his way back to the sheep which may be two or three hours' walking distance away.
522 Naturally the family are aware that these visits occur. Stories are told about grooms who tripped over milk cans as they entered the pitch dark hut or failed to convince the dogs of their true identity. They are considered to be hysterically funny; perhaps an indication of the ambivalent feelings which this conflict of loyalties provokes.

585 If the newly married shepherd is the eldest son the developing
596 pattern of relations has certain rather specific nuances. The family take an excessive pride in the first bride. They also take some trouble to make her feel at home, although at the same time their sensitivity to the attitude of the groom towards her is greater than in the case of the marriages of younger brothers. This after all is the first intrusion of an outsider into the hitherto exclusive family circle. More importantly the relationship between a father and his eldest son frequently shows signs of strain during this period. A father cannot in accordance with customary right long delay his retirement beyond the time when his eldest son has his first child, for it is an important value of this community that a man who is married and a parent should be the 'master' (νοικοκύρης) in his own household. But after the son's marriage and before the birth of the first child the father insists that he should continue to control the affairs of the extended family while the son is learning under his guidance the elements of his future role. Until the pregnancy of his wife is well established, the irritating uncertainty about the transfer of power, which will confer on him the status and prestige of a family leader in the community, sometimes tempts the son to show a lack of respect[*] to his father which previously he would not have dared to express so freely.

596 The retirement of the father resolves tensions between proxi-
577 mate generations in the extended family which are considerably aggravated by the influence of the prestige values of the wider

---

[*] Such lack of respect, however, is seldom shown in public.

community. A man who, although married and a parent, remained for a number of years under the day-to-day direction of an elderly father, however vigorous, would lose prestige and find himself the butt of comic satire. The fact that the younger married brothers work for a time under the direction of an elder brother in a common household is a different matter. The relations of brothers after marriage are based on free association. Policy decisions are a matter of consensus rather than direction. The suspicion against the man who does not relieve his father of his burden of responsibility (whether he wants to be relieved of it or not) is that he is nervous, diffident, lacking in self-assertion, and unable to be a 'capable protector' (ἱκανὸς προστάτης) of his family. 596 577 [558]

In summary, then, the first phase of the development of the elementary family is a latency period in which conjugal solidarity, although gradually developing, is subordinate to the sibling solidarity between the husband and his brothers and sisters. In general it may be said to last until the birth of the first child. Also, although there is no formal change in the relation of father and eldest son during this period, competitive friction between them tends to increase. 596 591

2. BROTHERS AND THEIR WIVES

After one or two years most brides have become mothers. This, naturally, brings about a great change in the bride's position in the extended family. Previously, although full membership of the group was extended to her, yet in an affective sense she remained a stranger even in the eyes of her own husband. After the birth of her first child it is said that the new bride 'takes root in the new family'. Not only does she take root, as it were, in the extended family but more significantly the new elementary family, consisting of herself, her husband, and the infant child, takes a definitive form. The arrival of the child is received with joy by the whole extended family whose attitude towards the bride shifts from tolerance to acceptance and affection for her as the mother of their tiny kinsman. 851 596 [594]

It is from the moment when the members of the extended family first feel this new affection for the bride that their control over her begins to diminish. So long as the extended family remains undivided and a younger brother of her husband does

Zagori

Admittedly every man must have

596 [577] some 'self-regard' (ἐγωϊσμός) but the family had to pay fifty shillings for this watch.

438 443 434 During the summer of 1954 Vasili worked for a Thessaly merchant who had come to the Epirus looking for wool. Vasili travelled around the Zagori countryside as his agent, buying up wool wherever he found it. By entering a price in his account book somewhat in excess of the amount he actually paid out, but still below the maximum buying price laid down in the merchant's instructions to him, he was able to make a very pleasing profit in addition to his weekly wage. When he returned to the family he gave almost all the profit to Theodoros 596 454 but secretly withheld six pounds for himself. Vasili had been married only two years at the time, but his wife was expecting a child in the next month. His conscience was clearly troubled at the deception he was practising and in his confession to me he explained that three years ago there would have been no point in keeping any of the money to himself, but now he was married, his wife was about to have a child, and he vaguely felt the need to have some reserve of money which was entirely under his own control.

596 The wives of the four married brothers live together in one domestic unit and work under the direction of their mother-in-law. There are many practical advantages in this situation of which they are not unaware. When one wife is cooking the communal meal, another is collecting firewood or carrying water while the old mother-in-law watches over the children. There are goats to be milked, wild herbs to be collected, clothes to be washed. There is the whole lengthy process of spinning and weaving. In all these multifarious domestic tasks the collaboration of the five women makes for companionship and a certain 596 578 economy of time and energy. But while the joint operations of the brothers with the sheep are based on a relationship of common identification, the co-operation of their wives is of a contractual character. The partnership works smoothly so long as each wife is thought to be pulling her weight in relation to her seniority. This clearly may often be a matter rather of opinion than obvious fact. And while the brothers are usually careful not to express any displeasure they may feel for one another, wives are only too ready to criticize one another in public.

Theodorina, the wife of Theodoros, is criticized because of

Zagori

In describing the process of development which occurs
within and between the elementary family of marriage and the 596
extended family of origin, it has been possible to document a 593
number of statements about kinship relations which were presented rather more formally in the previous chapter. During this review, a constant theme has been the inherent conflict
between the sibling bond and the conjugal relation. It becomes [85]
clear that the conjugal relationship only takes priority over the long established relations between siblings after the birth of children; and this is because, in the Sarakatsan view, the obligations of parents towards their children possess an absolute and sacred quality. Indeed, it is the conflict between the individual's roles in his families of origin and of marriage which provide the key to the understanding of Sarakatsan kinship usages. The individual's withdrawal after marriage from categorical obligations to the other members of the sibling group marks the isolation of the family of marriage; and the increasing kinship distance which separates the husband or wife from brothers
and sisters and other collateral kinsmen. And these processes are [62]
consistently related to the bilateral form of the kindred and the prohibition on marriage within its limits.

It is also apparent that the processes we have been discussing 596
are not unaffected by the dominantly competitive values of the 577
community. We have seen how the belief that a married man 554
with a family ought to be master in his own household so that he may assert the interests of his own elementary family of marriage, influences the decision of a brother to set up his own household. It is not merely a question of material interest. Prestige is also involved. This is clear in the case of the eldest son, who puts pressure on his father to hand over the administration of family affairs. For in this instance there is no immediate fission of the unit into two or more parts, merely a redistribution of roles. The assumption of the status of head of household is in itself a matter of prestige. It makes a man in principle the equal, in that particular respect, of all the other heads of household in the community, and enables him to compete with them in all those situations where the prize is approval of a man's conduct and ability as worthy of the ideal type family protector. Therefore, in so far as the absolute quality of the parental obligation is institutionalized in the kinship system in the separation of brothers' households, the kinship system is consistent

596 with the competitive values. On the other hand, two factors
577 have been noted which tend to hinder the young shepherd
554 from attaining the status of head of household as soon as might
otherwise be the case. First, an eldest son must show respect to his father and accept his leadership as long as he is physically active and capable; or until the son is about thirty years of age. This is another way of saying that normally an eldest son cannot take a wife and expect to be in charge of family affairs until he is about thirty years of age. Secondly, brothers, although married, must remain as a united extended family until their sisters are safely married. This, of course, reflects the original unity of the sibling group. Thus, so far as respect and obedience towards an active father, or the unity of the sibling group (which are both important values of the kinship system), delay the young shepherd from assuming the role of a head of household, the kinship system and the competitive values of the community are in some measure of conflict.

4. THE 'COMPANY' OF RELATED FAMILIES

474 It is some consolation to brothers who may feel a genuine
233 distress at the necessary development of their relationship, if
after the dissolution of the extended family they continue to
594 manage their sheep together in a 'company'. It is also a practical
convenience since the elementary family is not, normally, the sheep management unit in the winter unless it happens to possess at least 200 sheep and the services of four active shepherds. As we have seen in chapter two, the Sarakatsani prefer, in winter, to divide their sheep and goats into a number of different flocks. Where grassland is natural and scarce, the advantage of this division is that the optimum use is made of the pasture offered by any particular stretch of country. The
427 lower limit of 200 sheep follows from the difficulty of renting
very small areas of grazing from village communities. Also it is
558 damaging to the pride of a shepherd if he is seen standing on
watch over a flock of only forty or fifty 'zigouria', 'sterpha', or
464 'galaria'. Nevertheless, if poorer families with less than a hundred
735 animals are unable to find or persuade kinsmen to accept
them into their 'company', they are forced to work during the winter as wage shepherds for villagers, or occasionally for richer Sarakatsani, a situation which emphasizes their poverty and suggests the inadequacy of their kindreds.

Zagori

V

COLLATERAL KINSMEN

1. FAVOURS AND OBLIGATIONS

THE Sarakatsani assume that ill-faith, doubt, and suspicion 609 829
characterize the relations of men who are not kinsmen. In [612]
contrast, they think that the values and attitudes which [577]
make possible the communion of kinsmen are expressed in the meaning of ἐμπιστοσύνη, faith, trust, confidence; or πίστη, faith, belief. It is, then, not surprising that unrelated men very rarely co-operate in the management of their sheep or in any other venture; except, necessarily, the marriages of their children.

The rights and obligations of kinship are of a general and 612
diffuse kind, not restricted to specific situations. A man is confident that a kinsman will keep a secret. He opens his mind to him freely because he knows he will use discretion in what he should pass on and what he must not. He believes the information that a kinsman gives to him, and he uses it as a basis for action without the fear of a lie or a trap. He is confident that when his own conduct is being evaluated by the community his kinsmen will support his case; and for his part he will not suffer in silence the public criticism of any of his kin. Above all, he feels secure and confident that when he is in difficulty there will be people who care for his interests and will give him assistance. These sentiments of confidence and trust are prescribed and follow from the simple existence of the kin relationship; they do not depend on the history of a gradually developing intimacy.

When a Sarakatsanos receives a favour from another, he must 571
show gratitude. 'One good turn deserves another' (ἡ χάρη θέλει 577
ἀντίχαρη). Even if only between the acceptance of some service and its later repayment, gratitude must for a while act as a makeweight in the balance. Not to show gratitude for help, [626]
which has been freely given, is behaviour open to severe public reproach. But to be grateful is to be 'obliged' (ὑποχρεωμένος); and this is an admission of inequality and even of weakness. The rare attempts at co-operation between unrelated persons 609
have invariably ended in accusations and counter accusations 578
that one man has done more for the other who, in return, has

honour is very closely identified with the blood of the murdered 612
man is it possible that a cousin, uncle, or nephew may undertake 627
this duty; and there have been no such cases in recent years. In any case such a situation would only arise where the murdered man had no family relative, a brother or even an infant son, who could balance the debt of blood at that time or in the future.

It is quite a different matter when a man is physically attacked 612
in the presence of a kinsman. The latter cannot stand by and 579
do nothing; indeed, it is a personal insult to a man that another should dare to strike his kinsman before his eyes. Fights and brawls are not infrequent; they may happen in coffee-shops when a man is winning too successfully at cards, in a dispute over the boundaries of grazing land, or at a wedding when men drink to excess and see a veiled insult in each word or gesture. Yet these fights seldom lead to a killing. The Sarakatsani are very aware of the consequences of murder and vengeance killing; and even when they seem to be in the grip of ungovernable rage they do not draw a knife unless they see, or sense, that there are witnesses uncommitted by kinship obligation who will prevent them from using it. It is noticeable that in boundary disputes, where two shepherds may sometimes find themselves alone, quarrels are more often decided with iron-hooked shepherds' crooks, capable of ugly but generally not mortal wounds. In a brawl, as distinct from a calculated vengeance [577]
killing, a shepherd relies on the active support of a kinsman, for this does no injury to the interests of his family; on the contrary, the family gains honour by action, but loses it by inaction.

We must distinguish between two kinds of favour and service 612
which may be exchanged between collateral kin; and it is, 476
again, the question of responsibility to the family which marks the form of this distinction. In the first instance a man is able to assist his kinsman in a manner which cannot possibly conflict with the interests of his own family or become a charge on its limited resources. Shelter and hospitality, information about the affairs of other people and their gossip, physical support in a brawl, are examples of this kind of assistance. These services are true favours (χάρες) which in a relationship of personal kinship a man is bound to perform. 'We hold to our kindred' (κρατᾶμε

two previous occasions he had more wisely confined his attentions 684 612
to gipsy women. His family was in any case poor and of 627
low prestige. There was nothing at all to be said in his favour.
He had a number of kinsmen among the Sarakatsani who graze 612
the lands of the same village, and of these the closest was 684
Evangelos Balatsos, a first cousin. Evangelos and the other kinsmen 605
all joined in the universal condemnation of Nasios. During 627
the weeks which followed Evangelos made a point of going each
day to the home of Nasios and unnerving him with imaginary
accounts of the plots and ambushes which the husband of
Mitrina was preparing to lure him to his death. So thorough
were his efforts that for the next two months, until the Sarakatsani
left for the winter pastures, Nasios was never seen outside
his hut in daylight. Evangelos after his daily visits to Nasios [514]
made his way to the coffee-shop where he described to an appreciative
audience the state of affairs in Nasios's household, how
he remained each night, sleepless behind the door with axe in
hand, and how his wife was obliged under cover of darkness to
remove his faeces from the hut. In this fashion Evangelos took
a leading part in the shaming of his kinsman, and saved his
own name by denying solidarity with his kinsman and damaging
his reputation.

The possibility of losing the moral and practical support of 626
kinsmen, perhaps for ever, is clearly a most powerful sanction 612
of the norms of kinship behaviour and the values of the wider
community. If Nasios, a poor man who herded the sheep of
villagers, had possessed a substantial flock and had therefore
been dependent on the help of kinsmen in a 'company', this
estrangement from his kinsmen would have affected him even
more seriously than it did. It is also evident that the application 612
of this sanction by the kinsman is itself sanctioned by the threat 626
that a man and his family may lose prestige if he does not temporarily 558
abandon the evil-doer. Since the interests of the family
always take precedence over obligations of individual collateral
kinship, there is never any doubt that a man will conform. We
see, not for the first time, the connexion between prestige values [577]
and the isolation of the family; for these values necessarily
threaten the solidarity of any personal relationship or social
grouping which may conflict with a man's duty to uphold, or
promote, the prestige of his family.

585
612 festivals. An invitation morally obliges a family to send a representative. It is not a question of whether a man can afford the time and expense to go and enjoy himself for three or four days, but rather that it is his duty to attend and support the family of the bride or groom simply because the members of that family are kinsmen. A man may pay a visit to a kinsman or assist him in some way out of motives which are in part practical and ulterior, but he goes to help a kinsman at his wedding without such utilitarian interest. The kinsman may live in a part of Zagori or the winter pastures where he is unlikely to be of any assistance. He may be poor while the wedding guest may be rich. It might perhaps be argued that a man stands by his kinsmen at their weddings so that in return they will support the
[554] weddings in his own family. For it is true that if a large number of kinsmen come to a wedding the family gains prestige. But more important than this outward sanction is the inner concern for, and interest in, the personal affairs of a kinsman. In this matter as in the other moral obligations of kinship the Sarakatsani advance no explanation of why they must act in a particular way beyond the comment 'That's how we found it and that's
[577] the way we keep it' (ἔτσι τὸ βρήκαμε καὶ ἔτσι τὸ κρατᾶμε). In other words, in discussing the solidarity of the kindred we are dealing with self-evident values which appear to a man to be sentiments innate in every Sarakatsanos.

The wedding customs of the Sarakatsani reflect in many ways the solidarity of kinsmen. And although it is not my purpose to give an exhaustive description of these customs it will be relevant to the present discussion if I indicate in a general way how kinsmen participate in these ceremonies.

The celebrations are held separately by the family of the bride and the family of the groom at their respective homes. The only point at which the activities of the two groups intersect is when the bridegroom arrives on Sunday morning with his bridal procession of kinsmen (ψίκι) to take away the bride. A man who is related to both the bride and the groom must be the guest of only one side. He is not permitted to spend part of the time with both groups.

585 Each guest to a wedding brings an offering of food and wine.
612 This consists of a round of bread (κουλούρα) with symbolical
261 ornamentations on the crust; a wooden bottle (βουτσέλι) of
[431] wine; and a slaughtered lamb or sheep.

583 me with pride how she was beaten about the head and body and dragged fifty yards by the hair. The captured girl is taken without delay to a prepared hideout in a cave or forest clearing. Here she is held by the bridegroom for three days and three nights. On the fourth day, the man takes the girl to the nearest police post and gives himself up, explaining that he took the girl from her home because he wished to marry her. The police at once send for the father or brother of the girl, and in his presence the police officer asks her if she wishes to marry her abductor or return to her home. She is asked this question three times and gives her answer three times. If she says that she is willing to marry the man they are taken immediately to the [683] church and the service is celebrated. If she elects to return home, she is handed over to her kinsmen while the man is held to await trial on a serious charge which may send him to prison 583 for a number of years. It is remarkable that in the five cases of 581 abduction which I discovered amongst the Zagori Sarakatsani, there is only one instance of the girl choosing to return to her own people. During the days and nights when she is detained by her abductor, the situation is carefully explained to her. If she refuses to marry the man, nobody will believe that after three nights in the wilderness with an ardent lover she is any longer a virgin. In any case, she cannot expect to be sought in marriage except by a man of low prestige or a widower. [627] Secondly, if she goes back to her family, it inevitably obliges one of her brothers to seek vengeance on the abductor when he emerges from prison. And in this case, the brother in turn may lose his life in counter vengeance or, at least, be forced into voluntary exile. Thirdly, she is asked if it is not pleasant, despite the sudden shocks, to be married to a man who is willing to risk his life to take her as his wife. For these reasons, and especially for the first of them, the girl is more likely to say 'Yes' than 'No'.

583 577 Abduction, then, is a recognized institution through which, if the normal negotiations between two opposed groups for the arrangement of a marriage break down in a manner detrimental to his social prestige, a man may yet save his reputation and win his bride without necessarily precipitating the two families into acts of reciprocal vengeance. To refuse a bridegroom is to suggest that he is not worthy. The abduction of the

girl is a proof of courage and strength which refutes this 583
suggestion and reinstates the man's prestige. The bride's 577
family are extremely angry at the time but their reputation is not unduly damaged; the original assertion of their greater worth, which the refusal to give the girl implied, still carries some of its force and there is considerable material compensation in the fact that no dowry need be handed over.

It is, now, easy to appreciate why much thought and dis- 584
cussion is given to the negotiation of marriages. A marriage is [581]
an arrangement between opposed groups which involves important considerations of honour and prestige. Its negotiation is a difficult and delicate operation. The importance of the negotiator in the marriage settlement is that he stands between the two groups and prevents any direct collision which might otherwise prove fatal to the conclusion of an agreement. He is able to present to the girl's kinsmen in a relatively objective and calm manner all the virtues of the prospective bridegroom, and to bargain over the dowry in a disinterested fashion which cannot easily cause offence. If the girl's family decline the proposal, he is able to soften the blow so that it does not inevitably lead to the dangers of an attempted abduction.

The ideal marriage negotiator is a kinsman who is also a 584
kinsman of the intended bride. Such a man serves as a direct 582
bridge between the two unrelated and opposed groups. When the bridegroom's family ask a kinsman to act as negotiator and have not yet decided on a suitable bride, he will first search in his mind for a possible bride from those female kinsmen of his own kindred who are not related to the youth. In this way, it frequently happens that a man takes as his bride the cousin of a cousin. In another direction the negotiator may look among the kinswomen of his own wife or the wives of his brothers and cousins. It is not unusual for two cousins to have as wives, women who are themselves cousins or even sisters. Also, it is possible for a man to marry his third cousin. Such a union has the obvious advantage that the two contracting families are known to one another, but, among some Sarakatsani, there is the uneasy feeling that it is wrong that relations originally founded on the confidence of cousinship should be endangered by the ambivalence of affinal ties of which they are well aware.

582 of the community and the constant proliferation, through
602 marriages, of new relationships between opposed families;
612 and in the other, a moral participation in the affairs of the
619 different local segments of the geographically dispersed community. In both cases these considerations depend ultimately on the simple fact that 'kinsmen' and 'strangers' represent opposed but complementary categories of persons.

• • •

602 This completes the discussion of the general characteristics
612 of Sarakatsan kinship and marriage. Naturally the consequent system of personal relations has various implications beyond the field of kinship behaviour. Here I will indicate only one of these, but one that is peculiarly characteristic of Greek society and will continue to concern us in the chapters that follow.

59 As we have seen, the community from the viewpoint of each
602 individual is divided into kinsmen and non-kinsmen, 'own
612 people' and 'strangers'. The division is unequivocal; kinsmen
571 inspire loyalty and obligation, strangers distrust and moral indifference. Yet within the category of kinsmen itself the only stable solidary group is the family. Plainly, the nature of the physical and social environment is such that it forces this small group, however it may value the ideal of autarky, to cultivate both intensively and extensively the support of kinsmen and affines. But for reasons inherent in the structure of the kindred, which it has been my purpose in this and the three preceding chapters to analyse, that support is contingent upon a kinsman's prior commitments to his own family. Thus the family emerges as a social isolate in two associated respects. In the first case, families unrelated by kinship admit virtually no moral obligation towards one another; in the second, families related by kinship nevertheless owe only conditional services. In a
59 community where social relations are marked by such radical
602 discontinuities it follows that the primary values are necessarily
577 particularistic. The mutual opposition of family groups is expressed through the concept of honour with its connotations of exclusiveness, not the morality of universal values such as honesty or fair dealing. And Christian virtues such as humility, meekness, and self-effacement suggest only weakness; whereas

Zagori

strength is simulated better by the heroic attitudes of self- 59
assertion, pride, and even arrogance. Strength, individual 602
prepotence, is what each man needs to be an effective pro- 577
tagonist for his family, and the protector of its public reputation and honour against the calumnies of those who are also its judges.

Zagori

593 Publicly a husband addresses his wife in a stern severe voice. Requests are commands, barked out in sharp phrases. It is important for a man's self-regard (ἐγωϊσμός) that other men should see that he is master in his own house. In public the wife is meek and modest, silent and submissive. She does not smile at him or laugh with him before strangers. But in the seclusion of the hut matters are otherwise. She abandons the mask of expressionless humility and discusses with her husband all the affairs of the family, putting forward her own suggestions in a respectful but fearless fashion. Yet even here respect is implicit and a wife must never use tones of mockery or abuse towards her husband.

Obedience to her husband is a moral imperative for the wife.
[626] She will not be excused by public opinion, however badly she may have been treated by the man. She cannot refuse to co-
593 habit with him sexually. Conversely, the act of disobedience
839 by which she damages her husband most severely is adultery.
558 In adultery she makes her husband a cuckold (κερατᾶς), one who wears a horn. 'She puts horns on him' (τοῦ βάζει κέρατα), it is said. The implication that the cuckold wears a horn may be an ironical allusion to the sexual potency which his wife's action suggests he does not possess.[1] Adultery attacks the moral integrity and honour of the family and makes a laughing-stock
[684] of its leader and head. Thus, Sarakatsani always insist that if a husband surprises the guilty parties in the act, he must first kill his wife and then her seducer. The axiomatic acceptance of family obligations, the uncompromising character of the sanction, and the extreme difficulty of conducting such a liaison secretly, are all factors which contribute to the extremely low incidence of adultery. Indeed, since 1950, there appears to have been only one clear and unambiguous case of discovered adultery.

593 The disobedience of the wife in the sense of flatly refusing to do the spoken bidding of her husband is also rare. This situation or the mutual irritation which arises over the 'trivia' of communal living results in the wife receiving a beating with a stick. The Sarakatsani of both sexes accept the right of a husband to
[577] strike a disobedient or erring wife. It is also true, however, that men who are continually beating their wives (and certain men

---

[1] Cf. Pitt-Rivers, op. cit., p. 116; and Onians, op. cit., p. 243.

in the community have this reputation) are held in con- 593
siderable contempt. 577

The story is told of a shepherd who habitually beat his wife before leaving his hut to go to the sheep. One morning he was some distance on his way when he remembered that he had forgotten to beat his wife. He at once returned to his home where he found the woman working at her loom. 'Get up,' he shouted to her, 'so that I can give you your beating' (Σήκω, μωρή, νὰ σὲ δείρω). At these words, his little son, only four years old, flung himself on his father and tried to wound him with a knife. Whether or not this cautionary tale has any foundation of truth, its moral is clear enough. The unjust and over-frequent use of physical force by the husband destroys the moral unity not only of the marriage relationship but of the elementary family itself.

The wife submits herself completely to her husband because 593
she accepts her position as part of a natural and inevitable 562
order. Her sex is part of her fate. The physical strain of domestic labour under harsh conditions is immense. It is rare to find a wife after four or five years of marriage who retains the least
hint of her former comeliness. 'When you are married you are [581]
enslaved because God wills it so' (παντρεύτηκες, σκλαβώθηκες, γιατ' ὁ Θεὸς τὸ θέλει), the women chant. But the wife's acceptance of subordination and physical hardship is also made tolerable partly by her relative independence in her own domain, and more particularly by a consciousness of the significance of her position as wife and mother in the family, a position which relative to that of her husband increases in importance with the passage of the years. Therefore, a wife accepts her husband's authority, shows respect and esteems him, if he proves himself able to protect her children and herself and if he uses his power over his family with a measure of justice. The husband reciprocally approves of his wife if she cares for her children with love and faces her physical labours without showing herself to be that most feared type of female, a quarrelsome grumbler (γκρινιάρα).

The striking complementarity of the roles of the marriage 593
partners (and therefore their mutual dependence), and the 581
unquestioning acceptance of the husband's authority by the wife, partly explain the impressive strength of Sarakatsan

867 thought of witnessing such an act, he shook the tree violently so
858 that the guilty pair hurriedly made off. There was a general murmur of approval. 'You did well,' was the verdict of his uncle, the senior man present. In this way, the young child learns at an early age how people in various roles and at various ages ought to behave in any particular situation. He discovers that an infringement of these norms of conduct reflects upon the reputation of the individual, but also upon the general prestige of those with whom he is closely connected. He learns what is right and what is wrong very largely in terms of a responsibility related to the loyalty he owes as a member of a group which loves and accepts him; in terms, that is, of identification rather than of authority. The school years, then, are a time for the learning of new skills and attitudes, and a new role as a representative of the family in a wider world. It is a period of trial and error during which the child is constantly encouraged by the love and support of all the members of the family and other kinsmen. The importance of success is continually stressed, but occasional failure is still not an irretrievable catastrophe.

868 Children leave school when they are about thirteen years old.
883 Between the ages of thirteen and sixteen girls work under the instruction of the mother, and attempt all the usual tasks that fall within the general domestic duties of a woman. If she has a number of older sisters still unmarried she has an easy life, but in any case a mother with a view to her daughter's marriage prospects is careful not to overtax her physical strength. These years are perhaps the most care-free of a girl's life. Her beauty is not yet blemished by hard physical labour; she goes to many weddings and spends much of her time spinning, knitting, and sewing, in the company of other related girls of about the same age.

882 But from the age of seventeen until she marries, a period of
● 577 seven to thirteen years, a girl's deportment inside and outside the family changes considerably. She must now behave as a maiden of virtue who is acutely sensitive to shame (ντροπαλή).
[152] No longer may she show her feelings in an uninhibited way, and in her conversation and her movements a careful self-control is
[593] demanded. Her relations with her father now become less familiar. Since she left school at thirteen, a certain barrier has

already arisen between them, and from that age she is expected 882
in front of strangers to show him respect by standing when he 577
sits and helping her mother to wait on her father and his 593
guests. By the time a girl is seventeen there is a noticeable neutrality of tone in her conversation with her father. She is careful to avoid any reference to sexual matters or the possibility of her marriage. They are both conscious of the categorical obligations they owe to one another and the severe penalties
which sanction their fulfilment. If a father does not arrange [581]
an honourable and successful marriage for his daughter, his [584]
reputation in the community is diminished. If a daughter [558]
does not preserve her virginity and her reputation for virginity, [836]
she faces death possibly; or, should she avoid this fate, she must [684]
certainly endure dishonour and a dishonourable marriage to a widower or a poor man of ill repute. Although between puberty and marriage a daughter receives almost all her instructions from her mother, her father, to whom she is subordinate both by reason of sex and generation, remains the ultimate source of authority.

* * *

At thirteen, when a boy leaves school, he generally begins 882
his working life as a goatherd. He comes at once under the 593
direction of his father who in his role of leader and co-ordinator of the family labour group exerts a stronger authority over the boy than he has yet experienced in his relations with his father. A son is now careful to show his father respect. Occasional lapses in correct behaviour towards a father are not taken too seriously while a boy is still at school. He is, then, still a child and is in an obvious sense under the power and instruction of his father and the school teacher. He cannot, however rebellious his nature, become independent at this stage. The boy leaves school at an age which coincides approximately with the onset of puberty and at the same time he becomes a full and responsible working member of the family under his father's leadership. He still offers no threat to his father's position as leader, yet his sexual maturity and the responsibilities of his new status in the family foreshadow the inevitable retirement of the father shortly after the marriage of his eldest son. The firm authority exerted by the father at this stage, and the required attitude of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

882 respect from the son, serve to dissuade the latter from any
593 attempt at precocious self-assertion. And it protects a man from
the ridicule of his equals; for if a youth answers his father's
remarks or instructions in a rude or argumentative fashion,
other men smile with satisfaction and say that already 'the boy
is acting as family head' (τὸ παιδὶ κάνει τὸν τσέλιγγα).

882 The respect of the son is a general attitude which accepts the
593 authority of the father as right and legitimate. A son shows his
respect for his father by carrying out conscientiously the
576 instructions he is given. If he is under the age of twenty, he
does not smoke or drink ouzo in his father's presence. Similarly,
he does not swear or make coarse remarks or jokes about
sexual matters before his father. If a youth is sitting in the
[295] village coffee-shop when his father enters, he unobtrusively
[517] gets up and leaves. Drinking, smoking, and playing cards in the
coffee-shop are the social activities of those equal in status, and
are therefore incompatible with the respect owed by a son to
884 his father. After a young man returns from his military service,
593 when he is about twenty-three years of age, he will begin to
576 drink and smoke with his father at home, a step which he
275 generally takes at the express invitation of the father. The son
[701] no longer has occasion to leave the coffee-shop, but this is because a father knowing his son to be there stays at home or, in
a large village, goes to another shop; the son, similarly, avoids
giving embarrassment and showing disrespect to the father by
entering the shop if he knows he is there. If the son is in the shop,
the father understands that it is unfair to expect him to leave.
[561] After his return from military service, the young man becomes
a member of the 'pallikari' group[1] of fully adult but unmarried
● [577] men of the community. When he is not with the sheep, he is
expected to show himself in the forum of the coffee-shop, to
give periodic proof of certain outward signs of his manliness
by drinking, smoking, arguing, and by general self-assertion.
[559] He cannot do these things in front of his father, without
diminishing his father's honour and his own prestige.

593 The idea of an adolescent or adult son striking his father is

---

[1] Nowadays this consists of the young unmarried men who have completed their military service, that is of unmarried men between the ages of 23 and 30. The ideal type παλληκάρι is the hero warrior unencumbered with family responsibilities.

ἀπὸ κάτ' ἀπ' τὴ μηλιὰ θὰ πέση). It is thought that God often punishes a man in his children, a belief which finds expression in another proverb, 'The sins of parents torment the children' (ἁμαρτίες γονέων παιδεύουν τέκνα).[1] Clearly the inherent inequity of this idea is rationalized in the belief that the moral defects of parents pass down to their children. If misfortune falls on an innocent and blameless child, it is argued that in time the child would in any case have followed the evil example of its parents and thus merits the prophylactic wrath of God. 593 828 858

The relationship between a mother and her children takes its general character from the close physical and psychical dependence of the childhood years and the memory of this in later life. A mother is so closely identified with her child that even her thoughts may affect its welfare. When the nine-year-old son of Demetrios Carvounis went to Athens to sit a scholarship examination, success in which would have placed him in a school three hundred miles from his home, his mother in tears and distress admitted openly that she did not want him to go. People said that in the face of this attitude the child, however brilliant, could not possibly succeed. It follows that there is no defence against a mother's curse. 593 828

The intimacy of the relationship is antithetical to any very strong element of authority. Whatever ability a mother possesses to make a child of any age conform to her wishes, is the result of a response to her free and unquestioning love and acceptance. Unmotivated love (ἀγάπη) is the true basis of the bond between a woman and her children. Whereas the relationship of the father with his children is characterized, ideally at least, by respect (σεβασμός); but in this there is the hint of the external sanction of the father's power, and the child's fear of it. Both these attitudes of love and respect are represented to some degree in the relations of children towards either parent. But a Sarakatsanos would use the word ἀγάπη more readily in connexion with his father than he would σεβασμός towards his mother. Kin bound by ἀγάπη are in a relationship sanctioned by a moral sense of duty. In this sense the verb, ἀγαπῶ, in modern Greek, is opposed in some contexts to ἐρωτεύομαι which is used only to express the free unreasoning libido of sexual love. 593 577

---

[1] Not a demotic proverb but often quoted by the Sarakatsani.

Zagori

beyond the second year. Each morning at dawn, each evening 593
at dusk, during these long years she sings her dirges and 765
lamentations again. Even when the period of mourning is completed, she will never again dance at a festival, or sing a ballad, during the remaining years of her life.

If the role of the mother expresses the solidarity of the 593
family, its honour and integrity largely depend on her virtue. A 834
mother who is thought to have lost her virginity before 558
marriage or, afterwards, to have been guilty of adultery, or even an apparent inclination towards it, infects her children with the taint of her dishonour, and however closely these children may conform to right ways of behaviour, they cannot retrieve the reputation of their family.

Although the honour of a woman is so intimately connected 593
with the disciplining of her sexual activity as to be almost 577
synonymous with it, any lapse from social rectitude also affects 834
her honour; for it is argued that if she fails in the one respect, she is very likely to fail in other and more critical situations concerned with her sexual virtue. The wife of Costas Pistiolis is a woman who cannot restrain her laughter. It is held against her that 'she always jokes and never talks with seriousness'. This is an attitude unbecoming to a married woman of modesty with children and responsibilities, for it betrays a lack of self-discipline. Her family is, in any case, poor and despised. She ought to be conscious of so many worries that laughter should be impossible for her. It is insulting to suggest to a young man that he might consider marrying the daughter of this family. The girl, Chrysanthe, is acknowledged to be modest, comely, and hard-working. But it is pointed out that, although there is no positive evidence of sexual misconduct on the part of the mother, her uncontrolled and unwomanly behaviour makes the possibility of this not unlikely. And despite the seeming virtue of the girl Chrysanthe, the fact that she is the daughter of such a woman leads a man to await with some confidence the time when serious moral faults in her character will be discovered. Thus, upon the honour of the mother depends the honour of her children in a sense which logically precedes the mutual responsibility which members of a family in their conduct bear at all times for the reputation of the family. A brother can take some action to cleanse the dishonour of a sister, either against

593 579 the sister herself or her seducer, but a son is unable to do anything to wash away the stain of his mother's dishonour.

[834] The role of the father in the elementary family is concerned with leadership and representation of the group to the outside world. The management of the flock, the handling of money, and the arrangement of matches, fall within his sphere of activity and upon his successful manipulation of these affairs depend his own prestige and that of his family and its descendants. For these reasons a father must be an 'able[4] protector' (ἱκανὸς προστάτης). He must at least be able to provide his [558] family with food, clothing, and shelter. A man who fails in this duty forfeits any respect in the eyes of the community; he is heedless of his obligations, depraved, lost (χαμένος). But to be accepted as an 'able protector' demands more than this. A man must be a skilful shepherd and a shrewd bargainer, possess friends in the right places, and be of sufficient wealth to sustain honourably his family responsibilities. Above all, he requires the quality of manliness (ἀνδρισμός), to guard the honour of the family from rape or insult, and by his general behaviour in public to uphold the prestige of the group.

593 The father's duty of protection is balanced by his right to a position of authority. This is legitimate by reason of social convention, and is sanctioned by public opinion and in the early years by the simple fact of power. Children acknowledge the father's authority by their attitude of careful respect. And from this position the father is able to discipline them into accepting important social values, and to co-ordinate their various activities in the family's labour force. But the attitude of respect towards a father also prevents any precocious assertion of authority by a son which would damage his father's reputation, and place father and son in open competition. [471] The fact that all economic resources are owned corporately by family groups presents a problem for the method of succession to wealth and status in the community, a problem which inevitably causes difficulties between members of proximate generations in the same family. We have seen that by the time a son is approaching the age of thirty less deference

---

[4] I translate ἱκανός as able or capable, but it also indicates 'One who suffices, one who is able to provide', specific meanings which are significant in the present context.

Zagori

is shown to a father in private, but that public disrespect is 593
carefully avoided. Friction between father and son is lessened
by the definition in customary usage, within narrow limits, of
the age at which a son may expect to marry and hold executive
authority. In the case of an unmarried daughter, on the other
hand, the authority of a father is always more complete since a
daughter by reason both of sex and generation is subordinate
even to a father of advanced years.

We have already remarked how a father imposes scarcely any 593
discipline on a child who is less than four years of age. It is 861
difficult to describe the confusion and noise created by young 858
children in a Sarakatsan hut. If a father is asked why he bears
this with such patience, and would not a little discipline, even
perhaps an occasional beating, benefit the child, he generally
replies that the child has no developed sense of judgement to
distinguish between right and wrong, and that to beat a child
of this age will only destroy his love for his father, with the
unhappy consequence that a son may not treat his father with
consideration in his old age.

After the age of four, whatever his fears as to his treatment in 593
later life, a father's love for his child inevitably becomes increasingly 867
conditional upon the child's behaviour; for it is the 858
duty of the father to guide, by his approval and disapproval, the
child's first attempts to represent his family in the outside
world. And it may be suggested that the love of a four-year-old
Sarakatsan child for his father, which makes an immediate
impression on the observer, on the one hand is related to the
period of extreme permissiveness in the child's early years, and
on the other is a lever by which early steps in its moral education
are in part accomplished. According to its age and sex, a child
must assimilate certain lessons of conventional politeness, show
a constant loyalty to his family, and display a proud and combative
front before unrelated children of his own sex and
age. Already at this early age the importance of pride and [577]
prestige weighs upon the small boy or girl. Yet these values of
personal and family prestige, which it is the duty of the father
to foster and approve in his son or daughter, foreshadow his
own abdication from power at some future time.

From the moment that a son is subjected to the direct 593
authority of his father after he leaves school, a strong element of

Zagori

sisters have been settled. On the other hand, the honour of the 593
family which affects so intimately the prestige of the brothers, is [577]
largely in the keeping of the sister. Her honour is their honour.
Later, through her marriage, she provides her brother with new
affinal relationships of co-operation; he, in turn, is able to
influence her husband to treat her well. Brother and sister are
interdependent.

Since the female sex is subordinate to the male sex, the [562]
unmarried sister is always under the authority of her brothers.
There are no conventional forms of respect between brother
and sister but the latter obeys the instructions of an older or
adult brother without debate. A brother watches over his 593
sister's conduct and criticizes her freely when he thinks her 867
public behaviour is unseemly. This disciplinary care begins
at an early age. Ten-year-old Nausicaa was discovered one day [123]
by her young brother Charilaos, who is only six years old,
when she was performing for my benefit a very comic imitation
of how old men dance at weddings. Pink with the shame of it
and with tears streaming down his face, he vainly tried to stop
her mimicry.

After puberty, a certain formality enters into the relationship. 593
Physical contact is avoided and there is little teasing. Conver- 834
sation about family interests is easy and natural, but is more restrained in regard to personal matters. This is, no doubt, a conventional attitude which helps to maintain the neutral character of a relationship which exists between members of opposite sexes. But it seems also to be not inconsistent with the gravity of the categorical obligations which bind so closely a brother with his sister.

4. INTERRELATIONS

In all societies, the biological differentiae of sex and age 593
provide criteria for the ordering of social relations in the family, although the emphasis on each factor and their mode of combination is peculiar to the particular society.

As one might expect, difference in age or generation is an
equivocal criterion for the ordering of family roles in a com-
munity where the importance of competitive values is so
pronounced. Persons of different sex have complementary [562]
functions and they do not compete. Naturally, difference of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Not only are the various relationships between roles of 593
opposite sex based upon a complementarity of function, but the 571
whole complex of relationships between the two parents and the children of both sexes is similarly structured. No doubt the same statement might be made about parental roles in many societies. This is a matter of degree. But I believe that the very clear definition of the complementarity of the parental roles in the Sarakatsan family is related to two significant features of this community.

The first of these features is the relative isolation of the members of an elementary family from their collateral kin and the opposition of the family to all other unrelated families. A consequence of this is that almost all the individual's categorical obligations fall within the one small group; where also he finds the only source of unconditional security and support to which he is able to turn. Hence the relations between the mother and the other members of the Sarakatsan family group, of whose solidarity she is the material and symbolic focus, possess a particular intensity and unconditional quality. I have illustrated a number of ways in which the mother represents the solidarity of the family and the security to be found within its circle; in the valuation of the physiological connexion between mother and child; in the ideal of the mother as the unselfish and self-sacrificing giver of protective care. We have remarked the absence of strong authority in a relationship of intimacy, and the sexual virtue of the mother as the symbol of the family's honour and moral solidarity.

The second characteristic feature of the community that 593
concerns the parental roles is the importance of prestige values. 577
In the first four years such mild discipline as the child suffers 867
originates from the mother; the father and all other members [855]
of the family are loving and indulgent. After the age of four the father's authority is gradually established and the very strong affection of the child for the father which grew up during the first four years of permissive behaviour is used by the father to encourage the child to more adult ways of behaviour and to a sense of responsibility to the family group. The mother is now the more permissive of the two parents. As we saw in the case of young Lambrine, however harsh and angry the father becomes the mother remains compassionate and unchanged. Thus after

Zagori

593 the child's first four years there is virtually a reversal of roles
577 between mother and father. And this occurs precisely at the
867 point in time when the child begins to play a representative
[624] role outside the family. The behaviour of the child now becomes a legitimate object for criticism by outsiders and the reputation of the whole group is at stake. Therefore the authority of the leader of the family is invoked to sanction the correct pattern of behaviour; pride, loyalty, and fearlessness in a boy, sexual modesty and obedience in a girl. But the father achieves this purpose more often by the withdrawal of his affection and the encouragement of feelings of shame, than by direct physical punishment.

593 During the period of adolescence (13–21 years of age
882 approximately) the son or daughter must show a careful respect to the father and there is less familiarity. In the case of a daughter this is related to her sexual maturity and the need to discipline her actions; in the case of the son it prevents his premature self-assertion and protects the prestige of the father against the ridicule of outsiders. On the other hand, while a son's relations with his father are stable at this time, he goes through a period of some abruptness towards his mother in his efforts to prove his manliness.

593 As a son reaches the threshold of full manhood (23 years of
884 age) the importance of his prestige ranking within the 'pallikari'
[554] age group becomes incompatible with undue deference to any
[561] senior person, even his father. This is reflected by an argumentative attitude in the private life of the family circle, and publicly by a measure of avoidance which makes it possible for a son not to show disrespect to his father without, however, showing positive deference. But this period of latent competition with the father, also, sees the son renewing a firm attachment to his mother.

593 After his retirement the opinion of the father counts for little
888 except in questions concerning the marriages of his children and as a commentator on morality. Yet by identifying himself with his sons and daughters through an intense interest in his grandchildren he finds consolation.

593 On the other hand, the status of the mother (so long as she
554 is not physically or mentally feeble) increases with age. As a
888 mother of honourably married sons and daughters she has

transcended the inferiority of her sex and becomes the focus of 593
her sons' co-operation within the extended family, or later in a 554
group of autonomous households. Only she is able successfully [888]
to mediate and contain the conflicting loyalties of married
brothers.

It is clear that the various difficulties between parents and children are all related in some degree to the necessary involvement of the individual and his family in the community's system of prestige values. When the child begins to play a representative role outside the family the father has to educate and discipline it in a way that puts a considerable strain on a small boy or girl. An adolescent son in adopting the prescribed attitudes of manliness becomes abrupt to his mother. The adult 'pallikari' is particularly sensitive to his public reputation for honour and self-assertion, and it is this that bedevils his relations with his father. Thus the peculiarly clear-cut complementarity of the parental roles has to do with the fact that when the relation of a child (particularly a son) to one of his parents is strained, the relation to the other parent is one of positive attachment and identification.

In this complex of family roles and relationships the ties 593
between parents and children represent the core of the system. 577
The categorical obligations of parents towards their children are the values underlying the isolation of the family. They are values which in the popular mind are supported by their reference to a divine model, to the unmotivated love of God, to the patient devotion of the Mother of Christ. But sons and daughters must also be educated to conformity with the system of values of the wider community which makes demands even on small children; requires self-discipline and self-assertion in youths; and places young men and their fathers in competitive opposition while the former advance to adult status and independence. Throughout this process of development the moral solidarity of the family must remain unbroken. And this, in effect, is the achievement of the complementary structure of the two parental roles and their reciprocals.

It seems that there are three important contexts in which 593
the stability of family relations may be threatened by conflict 578
from within. In the first case, the integrity and solidarity of the family is destroyed when a female member willingly

Zagori

[p. 185]

VIII

THE FAMILY AS A CORPORATE GROUP

1. THE SOLIDARITY OF THE FAMILY

The Sarakatsan family is a corporate group. The property 596
of the family is owned in common. It holds exclusive [421]
rights over the productive powers of all its members and
the reproductive capacities of its women. And in principle all its members are held to be responsible for the action of any other member. It is true that, in effect, it ceases to exist when the married brothers divide the joint household some 40 years after the marriage which originally brought the family into being. But during this period its members think of it as a permanent entity, and in so far as they consider the future separation of brothers' households they see it at this time as merely a modification of their corporate existence which will be extended in their continued association.

The solidarity of the corporate family is symbolized in the 596
idea of blood (αἷμα). In marriage a man and woman mix their 826
different blood to produce 'one blood' which is the blood of
their children. One says of a child, 'he is my blood', (εἶναι αἷμα
μου). Relationships in the family are a participation in this
common blood. It provides the reason and the sanction within [577]
the individual's conscience for the fulfilment of those exigent
and uncompromising duties of family membership. The 596
relevance of blood to intelligence and moral character, and their 826
inheritance, is an idea with a long history.[1] But for the Sarakat- 828
sani, the blood which children inherit not only represents, but it 'is' the physical and moral attributes that form their social personalities. If a man is not of honourable lineage his blood does not 'take fire' at an insult; and when he is faced with sudden danger 'his blood is cut' (κόπηκε τὸ αἷμα του). These are not metaphorical usages. The blood centred in the heart is both the medium and the agent of emotional thought and feeling. Thus blood is intimately related to courage. And it is a matter of common observation that as a man loses blood,

---

[1] Onians, op. cit., pp. 48, 121.

596 he loses strength. Since courage and physical strength are
826 particularly the qualities that men require in order to defend
828 the reputation of their families, it becomes clear why, for the
[577] Sarakatsani, the honour of the family is literally the honour of
its blood.

596 The solidarity of the family group restricts the expression of
551 purely individual feelings, opinions, and personality. This is
[156] reflected in the way that individual members are normally
described by reference to the father, who until the marriage of
his eldest son holds the chief authority. After her marriage a
woman is never again addressed by her baptismal name except
[553] when she visits the home of her birth. She takes instead the
christian name of her husband to which the suffix '-ina' is
[885] added; for instance, Periclina (see p. 70, above). In this way
there is expressed not only the severance of a woman from her
family of origin and her subordination to the authority of her
husband, but also the absolute quality of their union. Similarly
children of both sexes are known by their own christian name
followed by the name of their father in the genitive case, for
instance 'John the son of George'. In the eyes of its own members
and the outside world, the family is a unity.

581 Whether we regard Sarakatsan marriage as a solemn contract between two opposed groups, or as a religious sacrament establishing the union of a youth with a maiden, it is certainly a transaction which transcends individual interests and desires. Just as the partners must be spotless (nobility in the boy, virginity in the girl), if the relationships which result from their union are to approach and participate in the qualities and nature of the divine model, so it is clear that either divorce or illegitimacy is incompatible with these values. To be born and to grow up in a complete and legitimate family is a minimal requirement for the honourable establishment of children.

586 In fact, divorce is permitted in Greece by the Orthodox
Church on a number of grounds including adultery. Among
the Sarakatsani I discovered only two instances of divorce;
but in neither case had the marriage been consummated. In
one instance, the father of the bridegroom advised his son not
to have intercourse with the bride because she was coughing
[739] and expectorating blood. The Sarakatsani are apprehensive
of tuberculosis, and after eight days during which the girl's

Zagori

to an outsider that a member of his family is worthy of moral 596
blame in any dispute. We shall discuss again the right to moral support, as well as the right to protection from physical assault, when we consider the concept of family honour. As to the right to material support, this has been dealt with in the discussion of family property. It remains, therefore, to examine a person's right to affective support.

It is only within the privacy and secrecy of the family hut 596
that a man or woman is able to relax, to laugh, to give affection 577
and receive it. The burden of public life is a heavy one. Outside 152
his house a man must be severe and proud. He must strut about like some turkey-cock as if his affairs were matters of abnormal consequence. He must on no account show his emotions unless it be an unrestrained anger at some actual or imagined slight. Publicly, he treats his wife and daughters with disdain, barking at them orders in harsh staccato phrases. An unmarried girl or a wife must walk slowly with measured tread and downcast gaze. Only inside the hut is it possible to abandon these conventional attitudes. After the evening meal, an act of communion 596
to which only a visiting kinsman will be admitted, the whole 577
family, men, women and children, sit or lie around the hearth 152
in no fixed order, laughing, gossiping and asking riddles. The (264)
centrally-positioned hearth, around which the family gathers, seems to symbolize a common fellowship rather than a hierarchy of relations. Despite a measure of conventional restraint in certain relationships, especially that between father and daughter, the general tone of the family in assembly is one of the utmost intimacy, solidarity and identification. Trust between brothers is proclaimed in the action of a younger brother who leans his head against the shoulder of his older brother's wife. It is an atmosphere of easy camaraderie and undemonstrative affection, which is impossible with unrelated persons in any situation, and possible for the members of a family only when they are shielded from the public gaze.

A person also has obligations to the family which gives this 596
protection and support. The most general of these obligations 577
is an attitude of loyalty and reciprocal support towards the other members of the family who must be sustained morally and physically in all situations without any consideration of the consequences. A sequel to the affair of the man who beat his

Zagori

591 577 593) daughter which we have just described illustrates the strength of this loyalty. This girl was a regular visitor to our hut. On the first visit after her ordeal, some expression of sympathy was made. The girl's composure was visibly upset, tears came to her eyes and her lips trembled, but she would not discuss the incident and even refused to comprehend what we were talking about. Whatever maltreatment the individual may receive in the family, he remains loyal in the face of outsiders. And indeed there is no alternative, for the individual cannot abandon or change his family, or live outside its limits.

596 157 Secrecy about the family and its affairs is a measure of loyalty and of the internal cohesion of the group. The Sarakatsani are, in fact, extremely secretive. As a matter of policy and habit they never give accurate answers to questions about numbers of sheep possessed or quantities of milk sold. The answers to taxing authorities are diminished, and to other persons, when the purpose is to impress, responses to the same questions are inflated beyond credible limits. The marriage aspirations and negotiations of sons and daughters are guarded secrets. Information about private family life is denied to all unrelated persons; and with reason, because people are always seeking to find or fabricate incidents of intimate family life to destroy the reputations of others. But secrecy goes beyond the point of mere discretion and becomes an end in itself. A Sarakatsanos declines to give almost any personal information to a non-kinsman, even where it could not remotely damage the family's interests or prestige. One housewife will not disclose to another what she is cooking for the evening meal. Two shepherds leading mules meet on a path and pause for ten minutes to deny each other the simple pleasure of knowing where each has come from, what he is carrying, and where he is going. The questions are as pertinent as the answers are evasive. Children are drilled into these attitudes from their early years. Asked by another adult Sarakatsanos or villager who his father is, a child replies with an air of false innocence, 'And you do not know me?' Secrecy erects a barrier around the members of the family and their intimate relations. The family secrets, whether they have significant content or not, are relevant, simply because they represent something which is denied to other people who are not members of the group.

Zagori

But the obligation that Sarakatsani must not on any account 596 fail to fulfil is the defence of family honour. Honour (τιμή) is 577 directly concerned in a limited range of situations; typically these emerge after physical assault or verbal insult, or following a sexual assault on the women of a family, or their own misconduct. Whether or not honour is lost depends essentially upon two qualities in the moral characters of its members; the manliness (ἀνδρισμός) of the men, and the sexual shame (ντροπή) of the women. Objectively, therefore, honour is an aspect of the integrity and social worth of the family as this is judged by the community; subjectively it represents the moral solidarity of the family, an ideal circle that must be defended against any violation by outsiders.

Honour is concerned with strength or prepotency rather than 596 justice. The most direct blow to the strength of another family 577 is simply to kill one of its men. His blood pours out and with it 627 go life, consciousness, and strength. Sarakatsani believe that in some way a killer absorbs the strength from the blood of the 826 man he slays. 'I shall drink your blood' (θὰ σοῦ πιῶ τὸ αἷμα), is a phrase that threatens murder. Given the connexion between strength and honour, it follows that the family of the killer validates its claim to honour, except in circumstances where the motive of the killing is itself dishonourable; such motives of dishonour include sexual lust but not theft. On the other hand, the family of the victim must remain inferior until one of its members 'takes out the blood' (βγάλῃ τὸ αἷμα) from the violator himself, or until he is at least driven into exile. One avenger bathed his hands in the blood of the original killer and returned to show his mother 'the blood of her son'. With certain qualifications that will concern us in a later chapter, all Sarakatsani are born with honour. But it is constantly threatened; and its conservation is, in effect, a struggle to maintain an ideal equality. When a life or the virtue of a woman has been taken away, something equivalent must be taken back if the family is not to fall for ever from grace and social reputation.

The family of the victim, then, have this duty of active solidarity[3] 'to take out the blood' of their kinsman from the

---

[3] The useful distinction between active and passive solidarity is borrowed 113 from Glotz. See Gustave Glotz, *La Solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce*, Paris, 1904, Chapter 6.

Zagori

596 person of his violator. On the other hand, the family of the
577 original killer do not have to suffer the consequences of passive
627 solidarity; a brother, father, or son of the killer is not generally
an object of vengeance. But despite the absence of passive solidarity in vengeance killing, the ideal course of a vendetta is still visualized as terminating in the mutual extinction of the two families. As we shall see, this is most unlikely to occur in practice. It is generally to a brother or son, more especially the former, that the duty of vengeance killing for murder falls. A father is seldom involved, for women and children are inviolate, and only in the case of the killing of an only son without issue will he be left as the one possible avenger. Normally, an unmarried brother avenges a brother, a son his father, when the latter has no unmarried brother.

During the period 1945–55 it seems that only two successful killings have occurred amongst the Sarakatsani that were specifically vengeance for a previous murder, although for the same period I have details of varying completeness concerning seven other killings for various causes (other than the hostilities of the 1947–9 civil war). One reason for the low incidence of vengeance killing is that the killer is generally removed or removes himself from the scene of action immediately after the event. Today, the Greek police are well organized and omni-
[578] present. Generally, killings occur either as the result of boundary disputes or questions of honour, so that the identity of a
[682] killer is widely known. He is quickly arrested and finds asylum in prison. When he is released from prison some five to ten years later, his kinsmen will advise him whether the victim has a brother or son able to revenge him, and depending on the nature of this advice the killer will either return to the community or move to another district of the Epirus or to Thessaly. Therefore, in most cases, the absence of passive solidarity in blood vengeance and the removal of the killer to prison and later to voluntary exile prevents the execution of vengeance. Exile is clearly not so honourable an outcome as a vengeance killing for the victim's family, but it strikes some kind of rough balance between the two groups. It relieves the avenger of the need to spend a number of years in prison, followed possibly by exile. The killer himself is believed to suffer considerably in his exile, distant from the support of his family and kinsmen. And it is the

reputation for manliness of the victim's group which has driven 596
him there. 577

But if all the dead man's brothers are married, he is unlikely 627
to be avenged. A married brother's obligations to his own family take precedence. If he were to kill the murderer he would be removed to prison, and afterwards would face exile or possible counter-vengeance. In either event his family would be deprived of its head at a time when the sons were almost certainly still children or adolescents. Yet the consciences of married men with an unavenged brother are never altogether easy. If the dead man has a son, however young, they feel less troubled. For this son will be expected to revenge his father before he marries. However, by the time the son is mature enough to act, the killer is probably an old man and removed from the public scene. In this situation a son tends to put off the execution of his duty in the hope that the murderer will soon die naturally without his assistance.

If the dead man has an unmarried brother, ideally the latter may not marry until the murderer has been killed or driven into exile. But if the dead man has also a son, even though it is still in the cradle, he will probably take a wife; particularly if the killer has a long sentence to serve. If the dead man has no son, an unmarried brother will certainly wait until the murderer emerges from prison, but if the latter does not then return to the community the brother will probably consider himself free to marry a year or two afterwards.

Yet despite the dearth of reciprocal vengeance killings, the idea of this obligation is very real, and it remains a potent sanction against light-hearted killings in a community with a taste for violence. Of five Sarakatsan murderers released from prison in recent years, three moved to other parts of Greece, and the two who returned to the community only did so because their victims had left no ready avenger on the scene.

The details of a vengeance killing which occurred in 1950
illustrate some aspects of the problem. During the civil war of [221]
1947–9 the Sarakatsani were unable to reach their summer grazing in the mountains and remained in the plains of Thesprotia under conditions of extreme heat and absence of
grass. There was a boundary dispute between the extended [578]
family group of Achnoulas and a 'company' of families led by
John Stratos.

591 John Stratos. Accused of stealing the grass of the other group, a
577 young shepherd of the Achnoulas family insulted a brother of
627 John Stratos, who struck him with his crook. Both families heard the shouts and rushed to the aid of their kinsmen. In the scuffle that followed the old father of John Stratos was wounded by the knife of one of his own sons which had fallen to the ground and was then picked up by one of the Achnoulas brothers. He died from the wound. The fight was so confused, with six men grappling in a body, that the Stratos family never discovered which Achnoulas brother killed the old man. Nor did the police. After a lengthy inquiry, nobody was charged with the killing since much of the evidence appeared to suggest that it had been accidental. The Achnoulas family felt reasonably secure from direct attack because of the anonymity of the killer and nothing happened for nine months, until one day George Achnoulas, drunkenly quarrelling at a wedding, told an adversary to take care, hinting darkly that he was not afraid of spilling blood since it would not be the first time. The Stratos family, informed of this incident, necessarily accepted the evidence as sufficient, and an unmarried brother, Charalambos, waited in ambush for George and shot him dead as he walked along a path.

What we are faced with in these seeming evasions, or half evasions, of a duty which is declared to be sacred, is generally not any real weakness in the solidarity of the family of origin, but the conflict of roles between the duty of the brother or son on the one hand, and, on the other, the obligations of a father to his own family, or the right of a brother or son to marry and found his own elementary family at about the age of thirty. This conflict is, of course, related to the bilateral form of the kindred and the isolated corporate family which is associated with it. It places an inherent limit on vendetta. Clearly, a community fragmented into family commonwealths, where the individual's categorical rights and obligations are contained exclusively in this small group, where the help a man can claim from his collateral kin is severely limited, and where a family to exist in any real sense must have at least one adult male to support and lead it, is peculiarly ill contrived to prosecute blood vengeance.

It is, then, not inconsistent with these considerations that the

Zagori

It is, then, not inconsistent with these considerations that the Sarakatsani have no notions about the blood or spirit of an 596 unavenged victim turning upon the kinsmen who have failed 577 in their duties. For this would be an uncomfortable belief to 627 accommodate where successful vengeance killing is contingent 826 on a number of circumstances. 761 This is interesting because, as we have already seen, blood is the material medium of kinship and its values. In other related contexts Sarakatsani clearly believe that blood has mysterious and intelligent powers. A horse standing outside a house when its master was murdered 'dropped dead from the blood' (ἔσκασε ἀπὸ τὸ αἷμα). A shepherd who killed a woman 'was seized by the blood' (τὸν ἔπιασε τὸ αἷμα). He was paralysed before his victim until the husband returned to kill him. For this was an evil and unnatural deed where supernatural sanctions rightly operated. Sarakatsani will even say that the avenging brother's blood gives him the courage to reclaim 'his own blood' from the killer. But suggestions that a dead man might be personally angry and dangerous if he is not avenged are met with amused and pragmatic disbelief. If care is taken over a man's burial so that the Devil [775] cannot use him as a 'βρυκόλακας' (phantom), a dead man is simply dead. Vengeance, then, is a duty owed to the honour of the family and not to the memory of a particular individual. And honour depends on the strength, confidence, and self-regard of living men, not on any mysterious or spiritual powers.

The problems which the duty of vengeance killing presents 596 to a family sometimes have an element of paradox. For in 577 prosecuting vengeance and defending its honour a family 627 almost inevitably deprives itself of one of its men. This may represent a dangerous weakening of its strength; and strength, it may be remembered, is the basis of honour. In the very act of defending one's honour one may in fact be jeopardizing it. The violator is always in mortal danger immediately after the deed, when grief and humiliation are fresh. But if he survives the first two years unscathed the victim's family begin to consider the situation in a more calculating and unemotional fashion. It then becomes a question rather of whether there are reasonable grounds, of the kind we have discussed, for 'not' prosecuting vengeance. This depends entirely on how the community views their predicament. [626] If all the brothers of the victim are married when the killer returns from prison, the consensus

596 of opinion is likely to be favourable to a policy of inaction but
577 mutual avoidance. There is, inevitably, some loss of prestige
627 but this may be the lesser of two evils. But mutual avoidance
626 (which is possible in this dispersed community) is essential. If
[558] the killer were to appear before the victim's brothers on a public occasion, such as a wedding or a festival, the humiliating confrontation would force the brothers to kill him or forfeit their honour. Generally, both sides have strong motives to keep out of each other's way. In the case of the vengeance killing between the Achnoulas and Stratos families, after some months the Stratos family may have felt relief that they did not know the identity of the killer. But the incident at the wedding was generally interpreted as a display of public boasting by George Achnoulas, and this made retaliation almost inevitable.

596 The loss of a life in a killing is seen as a loss of blood, and for
577 this outrage the violator ought to pay with his own blood. We have
627 shown that there is no passive solidarity in vengeance killing; a man does not generally suffer for a killing committed by his brother. This is a convention which plainly restricts the possible extensions of a vengeance killing and prevents a number of families from losing their 'protectors'. It is the analogue of those qualifications of active solidarity that we have already discussed. However, this does not detract from the importance of active and passive solidarity in other situations nor the significance of the shedding of the common blood. This is very evident in fights which do not involve homicide.

596 An evenly contested fight in which no blood is spilled is an
577 episode complete in itself; a fight of similar character and pro-
578 portions in which one side physically loses blood but the other
629 does not, inevitably provokes its own sequel in the attempt at some later time to draw blood from the opponent. But a man does not himself revenge the outrage which has been committed on him. This is the task of a brother or son. Also, the object of vengeance need not be the original opponent; any male member of this man's family is appropriate. In a typical dispute over the boundaries of grazing areas, Aristoteles was cut about the head by the other shepherd's crook. Some weeks later, Christos, the brother of Aristoteles, found himself at a wedding feast opposite the brother of the man who had recently quarrelled with his own brother. In his own words, 'I suddenly saw

Zagori

him there, drinking and putting on airs. I remembered that 596
his brother Vasili drew blood from my brother. I could not 577
stand it.' The consequences for the other man was a head 578
wound from a broken bottle before the two men were parted 627
and expelled from the wedding. It has to be remembered that fights and brawls in which individuals have the duty of both active and passive solidarity are relatively frequent, but that killings are rare.

The second category of affairs of honour concerns the sexual 596
conduct of women. The family has exclusive rights over the 577
sexual capacities of its women, and in this respect women 831
always remain *in loco filiae.* Here we are concerned not only 684
with external attack as in the spilling of blood, but also, some- 627
times, with treason from within when a daughter or sister betrays her virginity or when a wife voluntarily commits adultery. The will of a woman is vulnerable and her sensuality is evil. She is the weak link in the chain. For this very reason her sexual purity is an appropriate symbol of the family's honour. Its destruction, although itself a dishonourable act, in some way places the destroyer and his family in a position of superiority; for they have demonstrated that the woman is willing to abandon sacred loyalties for the gratification of her sensual feelings by a stranger. In these circumstances vengeance becomes primarily an act of purification. A father (or brother) must first destroy his daughter (or sister) and only afterwards turn his attention to the lover. Similarly, a husband ought first to kill a wife taken in adultery and then the paramour.

If it seems surprising that such violence may occur in a group 596
whose jural and affective solidarity I have been at some pains 577
to stress, this nevertheless seems to be a characteristic of small 627
groups whose solidarity is very intense. In the mutual identification of one member with another, there is no flexibility to contain widely divergent interests. We have seen that brothers, if they cannot reach unanimous decisions, must part company. Similarly, the association of family members demands absolute loyalty; the treachery of one member disrupts the group in such a way that this member's very presence is a denial of the qualities and attitudes on which the harmony of its internal relations depends. The objectionable element must, therefore, be excised. This is the only way in which the family honour can be

596 577 reinstated. And the father[4] or brother who accomplishes this
627 terrible work wins a grudging respect in the general community.

Families do not always find at once the moral strength to
596 take the only honourable action. In an affair between two
577 second cousins in 1955 near a village on Mitsikeli, the girl's
627 brothers first tried unsuccessfully to kill her lover. The girl then
684 ran away to the man's home; no doubt as much through fear
of her family as out of devotion to her lover. In another case,
which occurred in 1944, the lover of an unmarried girl escaped
from the neighbourhood after one unsuccessful attempt to shoot
[621] him. Although the girl's association with the man had been
notorious, no action was at first taken against her, but over a
period of six months the family suffered acutely from public
sneers and scorn until, quite suddenly, the girl disappeared.
The nature of her fate was never satisfactorily explained.

The most recent instance of the vengeance of a family on a daughter occurred in 1948 when a Sarakatsanos wintering his sheep near the Gulf of Arta discovered that his daughter was conducting an affair with a villager, who had seduced her with false promises of marriage. At the time, there was no other Sarakatsan family in the immediate neighbourhood, so that there seemed to be some possibility of hushing up the matter; but the girl discovered that she was pregnant, and the man refused to marry her.[5] The father took the girl to a secluded place, shot her with a pistol, and disposed of her body by rowing out into the gulf and sinking it with weights attached. Later, he killed the villager and dealt with his body in the same way. This case is often cited as the right solution to problems of this kind.

In cases where a girl is raped or a wife is similarly violated, or where at least the community accepts this presentation of the matter, the action is one of straightforward vengeance. The natural avenger is the brother for a sister and a husband for a wife. Such an attempt will certainly be made where an avenger is available, and it will be recalled that in the case of unmarried girls one of the brothers does not marry until all the sisters are

---

[4] It seems to be the opinion that the father who begot the girl is a more appropriate executioner than the brother.

[581] [5] Marriage is not an honourable solution to a premarital affair unless, as is most unlikely, the liaison is known only to the two families, and not to the community.

established in marriage, an arrangement which expressly pro- 596
vides them with this avenger. Consequently, in cases where an 577
act of vengeance concerns the sexual honour of a sister or a 627
wife, there is little chance of it not being executed through 684
default of a ready avenger.

A question of honour is also involved when a man breaks the 596
contract of betrothal. The girl's brother ought to kill him. Here 577
the attack on the girl and her family is not a physical assault 627
upon her virginity, but the suggestion that in this or some other 584
respect she is not worthy of marriage. And the knowledge that 686
the breaking of the contract involves an obligation of vengeance only establishes more strongly in the minds of other members of the community the suspicion that there must exist some serious fault in the girl. I know of only two instances of broken betrothals over a period of ten years and significantly both these cases were arrangements between Sarakatsan girls and village men. Marriages between Sarakatsani are only arranged after exhaustive inquiry and considerable debate; mistakes are thus unlikely. In the first of these two cases, the former bridegroom fled to Athens after he had lost the top of a finger in an unsuccessful attempt on his life; in the second case, the father of the unhappy girl had no adult son, and was glad enough to have the additional excuse that the man lived some considerable distance away. He was loud in his threats, but in the event he did nothing; and people were quick to point out that this was exactly the kind of conduct one might have expected from this particular individual.

Between the two categories of 'affairs of honour' which I 596
have described there is one important difference. In the first 577
category, a killing demands a counter killing, and in theory, at 627
least, this process may continue until all the adult male members of the two families have exterminated one another. The first killing which initiates the affair is not itself a random or indiscriminate act. It happens generally as the reply to an insult or as the consequence of a boundary dispute or some other quarrel. A man does not intend to kill in these situations, but accidents happen. The rough balance which in most cases, as we have seen, is struck between the two sides, satisfies neither group. The community remains relatively indifferent to ques- [626]
tions of 'right' and gives its preference to the side which shows
the greater manliness.

596 the greater manliness. In the second category, however, where
577 an affair concerns the sexual honour of a woman, the community
627 strongly upholds the 'right', in an ethical sense, of a family to
684 kill a man who has assaulted one of its women. For this act is
626 evil and dishonourable. An avenger in an affair of the second category does not generally go into exile, since his life is to a degree protected by public opinion. Where a balance is struck between the two groups in affairs of family honour, it is inherently less stable in cases of the first category than in those of the second. And this appears in the fact that two families, between whom there is a killing and an exile, are extremely careful to avoid meeting in circumstances where their presence may represent an affront to one another. Mutual avoidance is a means of preventing the disturbance of a precarious equilibrium. It appears, then, that the processes of vengeance provide through exile a sanction against killing, and through vengeance killing a sanction against breaches of the code of sexual behaviour.

596 When a man is killed or a woman is assaulted something, a
577 life or honour, is taken away, not merely from the violated
627 individual, but more importantly from his family. One group has committed a wanton and hostile act upon the other, and between the two groups a debt of honour now exists. Something has been taken, something equivalent must be taken back. Until some kind of a balance is re-established, the victim's family is in the eyes of the community inferior to the group of the violator, even where the act of outrage, as in the case of sexual assault, is in itself evil.

It is a peculiarity of 'affairs of honour' that they consist of at least two events between which some interval of time elapses. The first is the violation of family honour which is generally an outrage on one particular member; the second is the act of vengeance which is similarly performed, in most cases, by one member only. In both instances the individual as victim or avenger represents his family. If the honour of the individual and the honour of the family are analytically separable, in
554 action they are one. And if the execution of vengeance brings a measure of personal glory to the individual, at the same time it is also an act which is essentially altruistic.

558 The longer the interval of time between the two events the

Zagori

less effective is the response. To some extent this is so even 596
where the reasons for delay are physical: for instance, the killer 577
is in prison, or the avenger is not yet adult. But it is said that if 627
an affront to honour remained unanswered over a period of 558
years after an adult unmarried avenger was available and the killer physically present in the community, then the quality of the dishonour ascribed to the family would be such that an eventual vengeance killing would not reinstate the reputation of the victim's family. For, on grounds of damaging conjectures about the personal motives for this delay, other families would be able to continue asserting the relative integrity of their own honour by denying it to the family of the victim. The case is hypothetical since there has been no instance of this kind in recent years, but it is indicative of Sarakatsan thinking on this matter.

The defence of family honour is at once an indication of family solidarity and a process which recreates it. The honour of the family, the solidarity of this group, and the mutual responsibility of its members, are correlated notions. It is true that passive solidarity does not extend to questions of vengeance where a life is demanded, but in other respects it is complete. A man may suffer physical assault for the offence of his father, brother, or son. Further, if one member of a family acts dishonourably, all the other members of the family lose honour in the eyes of the community. If a man is killed or a sister's betrothal is broken, and the family remains inactive, all its members are equally dishonoured. Since all are responsible for the actions of any one, every member is accountable to every other member. All the members of the family necessarily form a single solidary group for the protection of their common honour.

2. HOSTILITY BETWEEN UNRELATED FAMILIES

In the preceding chapters we have seen that for each individual 619
this community is divided into the two opposite but complemen- 602
tary categories of kinsmen and strangers; trust marking rela- 609
tions in the one category, distrust in the other. Distrust prevents 578
co-operation between shepherds who are not kinsmen or affines, and the four or five men that are necessary to manage a flock are either father and sons or a co-operative 'company' of kinsmen and relatives by marriage. Moreover, the produce of the

S
G
571
662
G
[642]

a friend in the right place. The lawyer, or other patron, bridges the gulf of hostility and indifference created by the absence of relationship and the difference in status. And he introduces some flexibility into the rigid and uncomprehending administration of village life by a centralized bureaucracy.

S
G
571

In effect, patronage converts impersonal and ephemeral connexions into permanent and personal relationships; for in Greek society it is, generally, only in established personal relationships, of which the archetypal forms are found in the family, that any considerable element of moral obligation exists. The initial motive is utilitarian, protection and assistance on the side of the client, political power and social prestige on the part of the patron. But when such a relationship endures for any length of time it takes on a strong moral quality. The patron feels obliged to assist and take a general interest in all the client's affairs, and in doing so he is able both to sense his superiority and approve his own compassionate generosity. The client is conscious of a duty to support his patron politically without undue concern about his protector's party allegiance, and to give free expression to his feelings of gratitude and indebtedness.

S
G
571
554
S
[577]

The role of patron is to give benefits; that of the client is to honour the patron by accepting dependence. In a society where the concept of honour is intimately connected with notions of individual strength and prepotence, to abdicate one's independence, even to a person of power who is not a member of the community, is an act of renunciation of some significance. The patron in accepting the dependence of his client, who thus admits, implicitly, the inferiority of his status, himself recognizes moral obligations towards the client. The dependence of the client draws attention to the power of his patron, while the protection of the patron suggests that the client is a man of some standing and respectability in his own community. The first consideration protects the patron from the accusation of weakness or foolishness which he would otherwise face if he casually assisted a man of lower status with whom he had no particular relations of kinship, friendship, or patronage: the second represents for the client honourable grounds for the admission of an inferior status which in other circumstances would betray the honour of his community and his own manliness. The social reputations of the two men are now linked. If a patron cannot

X

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE[1]

1. THE HIERARCHY

A CONSIDERATION of the bilateral kindred and the marriage 594
prohibitions associated with it has shown that the only
relatively enduring kin group in the Sarakatsan system
of kinship and marriage is the elementary family. I have placed
considerable emphasis on the concentration of most of the
individual's significant obligations within this group; and these
normally take precedence over any other moral commitments.
It is a feature of evident importance that the community is [619]
fragmented into about six hundred of these exclusive corporate
family groups.

Within the community these families are jurally autonomous. 594
It is true that they must often co-operate with kinsmen or 619
affines in the management of their sheep. And in particular 571
though rare circumstances when the honour of the community
is in question, men who are unrelated may stand together
against villagers and others. Nevertheless, in none of these
situations is the sovereignty of the family compromised. More- 594
over, unrelated families see their different interests as being 619
in fundamental and inevitable opposition. We have already 578
examined various attitudes and institutions through which this
mutual hostility is expressed, for instance attitudes of intense
secrecy and distrust, and institutions of sheep-theft and mutual
trespass. Hostility directed outwards is, of course, the counter- [154]
part of the immensely strong jural and affective solidarity of
the family. And both are conditions consistent with the system

---

[1] In some respects there are obvious parallels with Homeric society, and 577
I have benefited by the work of Sir Maurice Bowra, *Tradition and Design* 171
in the Iliad, Oxford, 1930; Bruno Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, translated 113
by Rosenmeyer, Oxford, 1953; M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, London,
1956; and Arthur W. H. Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, Oxford, 1960.

Anybody considering the values of a Mediterranean culture is under an obligation to J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *People of the Sierra*, London, 1954. Bichr Farès, *L'Honneur chez les Arabes avant L'Islam*, Paris, 1932, is an interesting attempt to discuss a somewhat similar system of values on strict principles of Durkheimian sociology.

594 of patronage that links each family individually to the wider
619 structure of Greek society.

578 But, clearly, there is a limit to the amount of openly expressed hostility that this community is able to tolerate. Shepherds and their sheep are vulnerable, and in practice prudence discourages the free expression of hostility. The reciprocal trespass practised by shepherds who share a common grazing boundary is generally confined to areas from which there is a secure line of retreat; and in grazing disputes shepherds are careful to fight with weapons which may cause unpleasant wounds but
[682] are unlikely to kill. Wanton murders are discouraged through the removal of the killer by imprisonment, voluntary exile, or vengeance. By whatever agency this may occur, the family is too small a group to afford the loss of a man, and only an imperative obligation of honour justifies such a risk.

594 But this relatively limited display of active hostility is not
571 in balance with the unequivocal character of the oppositions
● 579 between families unrelated by kinship or marriage. These find
578 a more extended and satisfactory expression in competitive behaviour and values which have been mentioned so frequently. The sociological importance of competition[1] is precisely that it represents a kind of opposition which is often indirect. In this instance protagonists compete for social prestige, that is for something which in material form none of them possesses. Where the prize has this intangible quality, direct attack may be irrelevant. Indeed, since social prestige requires the favourable response of the community to a man's qualities and actions after these have been evaluated in terms of the accepted system of values, it depends overwhelmingly on the opinions of enemies. To oppose successfully other unrelated families in terms of prestige, men must compete to the limit in their adherence to these values. They do this without causing one another obvious material harm; and the more they oppose one another in this way, the more they affirm their support of a particular system of values and beliefs. In this context competition for social prestige, while it clearly encourages that family particularism of which it is itself a symptom, nevertheless gives to this competitive complex a certain unity and coherence through a common system of values. These are, as it were, the rules of the game.

---

[113] [1] Georg Simmel, *Conflict*, translated by Wolff, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955, p. 57.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

It may be agreed (and, in general, correctly) that in a system 594
where a number of groups compete for prestige, a strong group, 619
if it is denied the social recognition it expects, may in frustra- 571
tion turn from competitive action to direct violence and attempt 577
to establish its superiority by force; or it may attempt other 554
forms of direct opposition, perhaps through the use of economic power. But in relation to the Sarakatsan community the family is small and weak. Its inability to make alliances outside the kindreds of its members and their affinal connexions, and the physical dispersion of the Sarakatsani which restricts the activities of any family to only a small area of the total community, are other factors which would tend to prevent a family group and its allies from dominating the remainder of the community; even if we leave aside the certainty of State intervention if violence were used or threatened. Economic or political control of the community by one family and its allies is equally unlikely. Unrelated families do not co-operate to market their produce and consequently there are no co-operative institutions whose officers might manœuvre themselves into positions of economic dominance. Similarly, the community has no institutions of local government which the members of a family and its kinsmen might infiltrate in the attempt to establish a form of political control. The pathetic showing of the Association of Nomad Pastoralists illustrates the concern of all families to prevent the delegation of any effective representative power to others. Each family faces the total community in a condition of dependence. The position it is able to occupy in public life, the quality of the marriage alliances it establishes, depend entirely on its social prestige, that is, they depend on the favourable response of enemies; or more accurately, on the inability of enemies effectively to denigrate a family's reputation.

Prestige (γόητρο) and 'name' concern the Sarakatsani in 594
every context of public action. 'Better to lose your eye than your 577
name', runs the common proverb. This intense competition of 571
families to maintain their prestige against the permanent threat 554
of denigration, and the continual evaluation of other people's conduct, which is fed by an insatiate and hostile curiosity, result in a certain hierarchical ordering of Sarakatsan family groups. In the local gathering of families which share the

594 In the local gathering of families which share the
577 pastures of the same summer village the hierarchy of prestige
571 is based upon a fairly precise knowledge of the genealogy,
554 wealth, moral character, and conduct of each family; but, in
[621] the wider ordering of social reputations in the total community,
[619] elements of prejudice and speculation play a greater part.

In either case, there is more general agreement about the
594 ordering of families at the two extremes, which define the
551 hierarchy, than in its middle reaches. A number of families
554 with the surname of Tsoumanis by their wealth and descent
from a few dominating personalities of the past three generations are generally recognized to be the leading families of the community; these are the families of 'first lineage'. And certain of the families who bear such names as Tangas, Myriounis, and Ferendinos might be associated with them. On the other hand, families with the names of Sultanos or Pistiolis are assigned by general opinion to the lowest grade of social reputation; for them, indeed, social prestige does not properly exist. For the most part these families are economically poor and their genealogies lack any mark of distinction.

The positions at either end of the hierachy are not only more clearly defined, they also possess a fixity that is absent elsewhere. A family with the surname Pistiolis possesses large flocks yet it remains a family of the 'lowest lineage'. Its daughters are virtuous but their hands have not yet been sought in marriage even by men of indifferent social standing. However closely such families may live in the spirit of the community's values others do not give them the just recognition of their merits, so that certain of their number lose heart and are no longer concerned to act honourably; for in their case virtue is not its own reward. And the evidence of this reaction supports the original evaluation of the community.

594 If it is scarcely possible for such a family to gain prestige,
558 it is at least difficult for the leading families of the community
to lose theirs. There are few instances where a member of a family of the highest lineage has failed in a 'question of honour'. If a man is naturally timid he finds it all the more difficult to resist the immense moral pressure of family and community to act as he is expected to act. At the same time membership of a leading family in itself protects the individual from gratuitous slights. It is true that if a family of wealth and high lineage

594 554 571 [558] prevent any of their number from moving in an upward direction. There is always the possibility of falling to the category of those who are last, but the absence of any great differences in wealth, and the value given to the struggle to protect personal and family honour, hold the majority of families to an unwilling recognition of their equality in prestige, which is seldom admitted in speech but is less precarious than it seems.

2. HONOUR

● 577 The social reputation, whether of a man or a family, is a composition of various elements, analytically separable in description but with greater difficulty in life. Among these it is convenient to begin with a consideration of the concept of honour (τιμή) since this is fundamental to any assessment of prestige. Indeed, it is doubtful if prestige may be said to exist in its absence.

The translation of this concept by the English word 'honour' is useful if it is remembered that the analogy is only approximate. In modern Greek usage τιμή is conferred as a sign of the recognition of the excellence or worth of a person. It becomes the respect or esteem owed to certain persons, for example, to the heroes of the Revolution. From the point of view of the receiver it is whatever raises him up in the eyes of another and gives him reason for pride. In other contexts it may indicate certain qualities or conditions on which the reputation of an individual, or a group, is dependent. More specifically, it refers to the sexual virtue of a woman. It also describes the monetary price, or value, of an object or service. The last instance points to the common element in these various contextual uses. Τιμή expresses the idea of worth, whether this is an economic value in a market, or social worth evaluated in a complex of competing groups and individuals. Most Sarakatsani would understand this range of use, but they restrict their own employment of this word to the three last instances.

577 571 Among the Sarakatsani the concept refers particularly to the honour of the individual and the family, these two points of reference rarely leading to any conflict of loyalties since the solidarity of the elementary family is so complete. The situations in which this honour is typically violated or betrayed have

already been examined: homicide, the drawing of blood, 577
verbal insult, seduction, rape, and broken betrothal. 571

Honour, then, is a condition of integrity, of being 'untouched' by this kind of attack, insult, or betrayal. The integrity of a family and its equality (at least) of status is recognized when others take care not to give offence in these particular ways. If they do gratuitously commit an outrage against a family, they make it clear that they consider its social existence of no account. In that case, whether the violation is accidental or not, the outraged family must answer at once, and with violence, if its reputation is to survive. [627]

But honour is not only to be considered in terms of the various 577 external situations where it may be lost. The intrinsic principles of honour refer to two sex-linked qualities that distinguish the ideal moral characters of men and women: these are the manliness (ἀνδρισμός) of men, and the sexual shame (ντροπή) of women. With the exception only of persons of the lowest lineage, all Sarakatsani are assumed to possess these qualities 'by nature', although in the fallen condition of this world a reputation for manliness or shame is easily lost. In this sense it is not difficult for a man to move in a direction opposite to the true inclinations of his nature. One aspect of honour, then, is a struggle of self-discipline over cowardice and sensuality, flaws of animal nature that continually threaten to limit the natural nobility of man.

In general, the qualities of manliness are obvious and familiar. 'To be a man' the individual must show himself to be courageous and fearless. He must be strong in body and spirit. But there is also a nuance of meaning peculiar to a community where values are agonistic and social reputation is frequently at risk. In these circumstances a man must have boundless self-confidence in his own powers. Where few men owe him more than conditional support, and the great majority none at all, he must rely on himself. Manliness implies not only the condition of being courageous but the ability of a man to do something efficient and effective about the problems and dangers which surround him. For in this complex of values results count for almost everything and intentions for very little.

The physical characteristics of manliness are important. A man must be βαρβᾶτος, that is, well endowed with testicles [831]
and the strength that is drawn from them.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

577 and the strength that is drawn from them. The word also describes a certain ruthless ability in any form of endeavour. Here again we see the 'efficient' aspect of manliness. But βαρβᾶτος is in no sense a moral term, and in other contexts it may describe the dishonourable conduct of a man who rapes a woman or bullies weaker men. The manliness that is related to honour requires this physical basis, yet it must discipline animal strength and passions to its own ideal ends.

577 The quality required of women in relation to honour is
831 shame (ντροπή), particularly sexual shame. Subjectively the
834 woman's sexual shame is not simply a fear of external sanctions;
562 it is an instinctive revulsion from sexual activity, an attempt in dress, movement, and attitude, to disguise the fact that she possesses the physical attributes of her sex. Maidens must be virgins, and even married women must remain virginal in thought and expression. But honour is always something imputed by others. In these matters the individual woman can never retreat within her own conscience. Her honour depends upon the reputation which the community is willing to concede, not upon the evidence of facts in any case difficult to determine. Therefore she protects her honour most effectively by conforming in every outward aspect of her deportment to a code of sexual shame. The woman who succeeds in this is τίμια and τιμημένη, honourable and honoured; but, if she fails, she is ἀδιάντροπη, shameless, and σκύλλα, a bitch, a woman without restraint, whose behaviour is compounded of the reflexes of her animal instincts. She becomes 'used' (μεταχειρισμένη), if only on the lips of men, and therefore 'lost' (χαμένη).

577 The sexual shame of women is no doubt related to the ambi-
562 valent attitude of the Sarakatsani towards sexual relations
593 even in marriage. But it is also consistent with the importance
831 of legitimacy as the essential qualification for membership in
684 the family group. The sexual, reproductive, and working capacities of women belong exclusively to their families; and there is no more certain way of defiling the honour of another family than by seducing one of its women, particularly since mixed attitudes of awe and shame surround the sexual act and the reproductive life process. There is double cause for shame. Something of intimate spiritual value is rifled and desecrated by a stranger while at the same time the moral

Zagori

blame for this loss is generally ascribed by the community to 577
the sensuality of the woman and, by extension, to the moral 562
weakness of her kinsmen. 593

This kind of shame is a quality that is thought to descend 831
in the female line from mother to daughter, but its loss always 684
implicates the honour of the men of the family, reflecting on
the manliness of the husband, and, more generally, on the 577
whole social personality of brothers and, particularly, sons. 831
The woman is soiled, λερωμένη, and blackened, μουντζουρωμένη; 593
and she marks with her dishonour all those who are close to 562
her through kinship or marriage. Essentially, sexual shame is 828
felt to be an inborn moral characteristic, part of a woman's
personality. Conventional deportment requires training of
course; but however thorough her education the true character
of a naturally shameless woman is certain to emerge, for fundamentally
sexual shame is a question of heredity. If it becomes
known that a young maiden has been struck by her father or
brother because of some immodesty, people laugh and ask
rhetorically what good do they imagine this will do since the
fault proceeds from her mother.

Clearly manliness and shame are complementary qualities 577
in relation to honour. The manliness of the men in any family 831
protects the sexual honour of its women from external insult or 562
outrage. The women must have shame if the manliness of the 593
men is not to be dishonoured. We saw in an earlier chapter
how the dishonour of a mother cannot be remedied by the sons.
It is true that when a man kills a daughter who has lost her
honour he wins the grudging respect of the community; yet,
at the same time, the dishonour of the family is never entirely
forgotten. Even when the rape of a sister has been avenged, a
measure of dishonour remains, the dishonour of the girl's
failure to preserve her virginity. The reputation for manliness
of the men of the family is a deterrent against external outrage,
but it cannot entirely repair the damage if such an attack
against its women proves successful. It is, then, not surprising
that the worst insult that can be aimed at a man is to use
the name of his sister, or mother, in an unpleasant sexual
context.

Honour considered as the possession by men and women of 577
these qualities is the attempt to relate existence to certain 773
776
562

577 773 562 [776] archetypal patterns of behaviour. Female values are referred to the ideal conduct of the Mother of God: modesty, virginal attitudes, and selfless love. Male values appear in different exemplars. Christ is the ideal of continence and selfless sacrifice even of life for those to whom one is committed: the horsed and warlike saints George and Demetrius present the pattern of assertive courage, physical, spiritual, and invulnerable. Nearer to the realities of a shepherd's life, these two aspects of ideal manliness meet in the legendary image of the klephtic hero, a man who so refined his powers of courage and continence that he partly transcended the limitations of the material world. Bullets could not find their mark on Katsandonis. Shepherds in Zagori know the place where he leaped his horse a hundred paces across a chasm. Such heroes are both prepotent and efficient. Whatever the odds, these men always defeat their enemy, except in the final contest when only the pre-ordained moment of fate and the presence of Charon succeed in taking away life. The last struggle of the hero, although hopeless, is heroic, a final flourish of his essentially human worth in the face of fate. But, in the end, honour wins over death and the hero lives on in the songs that commemorate his fame.

577 562 Men and women, then, struggle to attain these ideal modes of being and conduct. Where they fall too far short in the effort of identification honour is lost. As I have said earlier, honour and the two sex-linked values of manliness and shame, which are associated with it, are qualities that, in principle, the majority of families are presumed to possess. It is the natural birthright of most Sarakatsani to be manly and of their sisters
577 to have shame. Therefore, in the sense that τιμή is used by the
578 Sarakatsani, it is difficult to talk of competition to win more honour than another man or another family. Honour is something which most families are presumed to have, but which they may very easily lose if they do not guard it with all their resources of courage and self-discipline. There is, rather, a constant struggle to maintain an ideal state of equality in honour between most individuals and families. And since the downfall of one family validates and in some sense improves the status of other families, men attempt by every means of allusive gossip and criticism of conduct to deny each other their pretensions to honour.

Zagori

Even in the most favourable circumstances loss of honour is 577 unlikely to be entirely remedied within the living memory of 558 those who know of the affair. A man whose family has lost its honour cannot in any real sense be said to possess prestige at all. People say of a man who has allowed his father's slayer to remain undisturbed in the same neighbourhood, 'We don't even say "good morning" to him'. In fact this is not true. People do greet him, but formally and without enthusiasm. He is occasionally seen in the coffee-shop, but he sits in a corner and little attention is paid to him. He is tolerated but his prestige is negative. Loss of honour does not mean direct social ostracism. The sanction is more subtle; it implies the withdrawal of full recognition or response.

Although honour is an essential prerequisite of prestige it 577 is not itself entirely independent of it. Families which on quite 554 different grounds, such as poverty, have no prestige and are 735 classed generally as 'lost' families (χαμένες οἰκογένειες), are denied the imputation of honour even though no positive accusation of dishonour can be pointed against them. Quite small incidents, which are not in themselves exactly questions of honour, are seized upon by the community to show prospectively that such a family, if it were faced by the duty of defending its honour, would be found wanting. The family of Costas Pistiolis is very poor. In the Sarakatsan view there must always be something morally wrong with a very poor man, and given their system of values this is not difficult to understand. A poor man is dependent on others for employment, or favours, if his family is to survive. He is not in a position to insist upon an equality in honour which, in any case, the community will not allow him. One day I saw a youth pelting the little son of Costas with pieces of dung in his father's presence. Costas, however, could do nothing since the youth's father was an influential member of the co-operating group which only tolerated with difficulty the presence of the Pistiolis family among its number. Another witness of the little scene swore and told me that you could copulate with this man's daughter and he would stand by and hold your coat.

Any attack made on the family's honour demands an immediate 577 response. Failure to respond fatally damages the 554 prestige of the outraged group and all its members. Without [558]

577 honour prestige is not possible. But also for those families, which
554 on other grounds have no prestige, honour itself is already lost.

156 3. THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS

554 The number of roles which the individual is required or able to assume in this community is limited, and some description of these has already been given in earlier chapters. Whether or not the individual fulfils the more general expectations of his various roles is a further consideration in the assessment of his prestige. Therefore, in this section I shall discuss certain values and qualities which are associated with the different complexes of roles that are appropriate for men and women at
[577] various stages of life. These are related to honour and the concepts of manliness and shame but are not always entirely consistent with them.

562 Together with age, the division of the sexes is the significant
[561] discriminating factor in the system of social roles. The two opposed but complementary categories of persons that result from this division provide both a division of labour and a pattern of moral virtues and faults.

462 The division of labour is unambiguous but not rigid. Some tasks which are normally performed by one sex are carried out by persons of the other sex in an emergency. This does not provoke criticism except where the reversal of roles becomes an
[558] established feature of a family's working arrangements.* A family which day after day sends a twelve-year-old daughter to herd goats will certainly lose prestige. There are, however, a number of tasks which are never attempted by the other sex. For example, women never milk sheep or use a shepherd's crook; men almost never milk goats. Although men will lift heavy objects to secure them to a mule, they never carry burdens on their backs. However sick or feeble his wife or daughter a man will never help her with the intolerable burden of heavy
[562] water barrels. These tasks have become diacritical symbols of the two sexes; and to ignore them is to deny that one possesses the essential qualities of one's sex, manliness or shame.

834 As we have seen in earlier chapters, companionship and
562 co-operation between people of opposite sex is possible only within the family and the kindred. Outside these limits the sexes (except in the case of the very old and the very young)

562 find in it. A bride, during the last days before her wedding,
602 is kept company by those unmarried kinswomen who live close
831 at hand. They help her in the last feverish preparations of her dowry. The girls sympathize with the bride, but say that they will never leave their homes to submit themselves to a strange man. The bride applauds their decision, and says that she will secrete a knife upon her person and that when the bridegroom comes to her she will castrate him.

521 Unrelated men, when they are gathered together, criticize
562 women in a general way. Wives, it is often said contemptuously,
831 need two things, copulation and beating. But men are not given
577 to obscenity except in oaths, and they do not discuss the intimacies of sexual relations, since these concern their manliness in a very literal sense; moreover, any discussion of a woman's sexual qualities diminishes her honour.

562 The opposition of the two sexes is also reflected in a pattern
577 of sex-linked attributes which are antithetical but comple-
828 mentary. Men are courageous, austere, possess manliness and pride, but lack patience. Women are fearful, lacking in resolution but have greater depths of love; they are sensitive to shame, modest and patient. However, the masculine values transcend this opposition and provide the ideal virtues of the total community. Men must never in any circumstances be too modest or sensitive to shame. But when their family is threatened with violence and outrage, even women will find a pride and courage of heroic quality, and for this they will be honoured.

562 If the female sex is opposed to the male sex, it is also inferior.
828 The Sarakatsani believe that man is a being created by God
783 for the highest and the noblest purposes. Since the Fall there has been a legacy of sin in his constitution yet all in all he remains
[779] noble. The flaws in the human condition are envy and sexuality, for these are the thoughts and desires that particularly have the power to turn men's thoughts away from God and from the struggle to draw closer to Him. Manliness has a physiological basis but it only becomes a true manliness when it is disci-
562 plined and spiritualized. Sexual intercourse, then, is not an
783 unmixed good. It is something which is 'unseemly' or 'out of
833 alignment' (ἀνάποδο). In some way it pollutes (μαγαρίζει). After sleeping with his wife a shepherd ought to wash his hands before milking sheep. A ewe is a 'sacred thing' (ἱερὸ

πρᾶμα), and παρμάρα, a disease which attacks the udder of the 562
sheep, is often attributed to the omission of this precaution. 783
Another illustration of this idea of pollution is the prohibition 833
of sexual intercourse on the eve, or the day, of an important [834]
religious festival. Sexual activity is necessary in that it produces children, who are God's children, but evil in that some sensuality is unavoidable. It must be performed in the utmost secrecy, without speech, and the woman must remain motionless and passive. It is thought shameful for a husband to gaze on his wife's body.

In this situation, where man is noble (as indeed he must be 562
in a system of values that puts stress upon the concept of honour), 577
but where certain aspects of his propagation are matters for 831
shame, the discomfort of inconsistency is avoided in a kind of 828
sexual dualism. If man is nearly all nobility, a natural predisposition to evil (κακία) is the most striking feature of the female character. She is above all cunning, especially in the sense that her cunning involves the corruption of another, that is the man. She is a constant threat to his honour. Πονηρός, [776]
cunning, is typically the adjective which also describes the Devil, and the Sarakatsani believe that the Devil has a hold over women who are his peculiar emissaries dispatched to provoke men's hearts with sexual passions. Thus the whole burden of the shame of sexual relations is shifted on to the female sex. Since her powers of sexual attraction are of this supernatural order, man, in general, is unable to resist them. It is simply the quality in a woman of being a woman which inflames the man. She may lure him to disaster without even a glance or a gesture. Once he advances on her she has not the strength to resist him. In the Sarakatsan view, the power of woman's sexuality, the weakness of her will, and the physical strength of a man, are the important factors involved in sexual activity. It is for these [834]
reasons that the individual woman is expected by her kinsmen to have 'shame', in the sense that in speech, gesture, attitude, and dress, she must, as far as possible, cloak the existence of this sexuality. For the same reasons the family watches over its women with the greatest care; especially in the case of an unmarried girl anxious eyes follow her if she must go to the well or collect firewood unaccompanied.

These beliefs about the sexes are accepted by the women as 562
828

Zagori

562 well as the men. They admit that they do not possess the intelli-
828 gence of men. But they take a certain perverse and compensa-
tory pride in their reputation for cunning and the ability to
deceive their men 'forty times each day'. They agree that
women are weak, and that the fault in cases of seduction or adul-
tery lies mainly with the girl or the wife. Therefore they accept
it as right that, in the first place, retribution should fall on the
woman. In customary behaviour this social and moral in-
feriority is expressed in a number of ways. Women walk behind
their men when they are together in public and show them
respect. In church the women huddle at the back or line the
left-hand wall. Women agree that they are inferior to men in
every way, and they continually bemoan their fate that they
were not born into the other sex.

562 Nevertheless, through the possession of shame it is always
828 open to a woman to discipline and redeem her sexuality. The
577 inclinations of her nature, whether conscious or not, make this
[831] difficult; but it is the prerequisite of honour. Virginity is a
quality which provokes the deepest respect and a sense almost
of awe. But the moral dualism of the sexes is finally transcended
through the paradox that from women are born the noble sons
[554] who will protect the honour of the race. And, as the mother of
adult sons whose reputation for manliness is untouched, and
as a woman now past the period of her active sexuality, she has
almost overcome the moral disabilities of her sex.

* * *

562
156 This opposition of the sexes provides the frame for contrasted
561 ideal types of social personality for men and women at each of
the three stages of adult life.

884 For the unmarried but adult shepherds, the boys (τὰ παιδιά),
826 the pallikaria (τὰ παλληκάρια), physical perfection is an im-
portant ideal attribute. A youth ought to be tall, slim, agile,
and tough. Ideally, at least, a pallikari is never short in stature.
A certain regularity and openness of feature is desirable but with-
out any hint of effeminate fineness. Swarthy complexions and
[232] narrowly set eyes are deplored. Any kind of physical deformity
is fatal to the reputation of a young shepherd.

884 But moral qualities are also demanded of the young shepherd,
577 especially courage and strength of purpose. If in addition to
554

these qualities he also possesses the necessary physical attri- 884
butes a young Sarakatsanos can fairly claim to be λεβέντης 577
καὶ παλληκάρι. The first of these terms is perhaps the more 554
composite, describing a youth who is handsome, manly, narrow-hipped, and nimble; such a youth will distinguish himself at a wedding by his upright carriage, restrained manner towards his elders, and his agility in the dance. Παλληκάρι is rather the hero warrior with physical strength and assertive courage who is prepared to die, if necessary, for the honour of his family or his country. Caution must always be foreign to his nature.

It is also said that the young shepherd is free and independent. 156
This does not indicate a freedom from social obligation that 884
permits the indulgence of individual fancy. On the contrary, it means an independence from the cares and duties of a married head of family that frees the young unmarried man to give all his thoughts to the defence and vindication of personal and family honour. A head of family must consider what will happen to his wife and children if through involvement in some affair of honour he is killed or thrown into prison.

Since it is only in the years before he assumes the practical 884
responsibilities of parenthood that a man is both innocent of 156
the sexuality of woman and free to model his actions without 554
compromise according to the ideal pattern of honour, these 577
years of youthful manhood (τὰ νιᾶτα) represent for the Sarakatsani a time of perfected manliness when a man reaches as high a point of moral refinement as the human condition will normally allow. Speaking of his youngest unmarried brother Elias, Demetrios Carvounis explained that he, as leader of his family in a world where the majority of men are without love of honour, was forced from time to time to acts which his conscience did not approve. One day it might be necessary for him to go into court, place his hand on the Holy Bible, and swear falsely to save a member of his family, or his stani, from a crippling fine. Another day he must forgo his natural pride and obsequiously seek the aid of some Government servant. Deceit and lies are always needed in his work. On the other hand Elias was every day with the sheep on the high ridges in the clean mountain air, alone or with a single trusted comrade. Evil could not touch Elias in the same way.

884 He was simple and innocent (ἁπλὸς καὶ ἀθῶος); not simple in
156 the meaning of an absence of intelligence but in a simple
577 singleness of purpose; and innocent in the sense of freedom from
831 guilt or the need to use guile. Such young men, Demetrios added, since they do not know women, are παστρικοί, that is, clean and pure. Male virginity is the ideal. And continence is thought to confer a certain invulnerability on those who face dangers, especially the danger of bullets in war or brigandage. Of sex relations in marriage Aristoteles, a young man of 28, who in every way conforms in conduct and person to the ideal pallikari pattern, was able to say before other men that he was ashamed even to think of them. Sex, sin, and death are related;
[581] similarly virginity, continence, and life. The Sarakatsani anticipate marriage with joy, but also with regret. The founding of a family is wholly good, yet marriage, sex relations, and children,
[559] inevitably foreshadow death. The pallikari, not the head of family, is the ideal of manhood.

884 It is during these years of early manhood that the community
554 begins seriously to take stock of a man. His marriage will be the means of linking two families in affinal alliance, and the assessment of his manliness is one factor which, in part, deter-
[302] mines how other people will treat his family. When he is
[411] twenty or twenty-one years old and shortly before he goes on military service, he will grow a moustache, and his father, or brother, will buy him a broad-bladed dagger. These are the outward symbols of his assumption of the status of manhood and of his pretension to be a pallikari.

156 The community will gradually form an opinion of his prowess
884 as a shepherd, his fearlessness on the high ridges, his devotion to
554 a sick or injured sheep, and his skill in grazing. It is difficult to
577 say how this opinion is formed, since unrelated shepherds
578 seldom work together. Possibly the estimate is sometimes inaccurate. But the critical moment in the development of the young shepherd's reputation is his first quarrel. Quarrels are necessarily public. They may occur in the coffee-shop, the village square, or most frequently on a grazing boundary where a curse or stone aimed at one of his straying sheep by another shepherd is an insult which inevitably requires a violent response. In any case some account of the event becomes public property. If the quarrel occurs before unrelated bystanders, the

Zagori

community may obtain a reasonably factual account of the 156
fight. If it is not witnessed by an impartial audience, the con- 884
testant with the fewer marks of injury and the greater number 554
of persuasive kinsmen wins the day. It is the critical nature of 577
these first important tests of his manliness that makes the self- 578
regard (ἐγωϊσμός) of the young shepherd so extremely sensitive. It is not only the reality of an obvious insult which provokes him to action, but even the finest of allusions on which it is possible to place some unflattering construction. To direct the slightest public mockery (χορόϊδευμα) against a young shepherd challenges him to fight. It may be possible to recover from an early failure of nerve and conduct, but a series of failures is fatal to a man's reputation. The more clearly his weakness is exposed the more often he risks open ridicule, and only the careful protection of brothers and kinsmen will save him from complete social obloquy. In fact there are few failures. Few physically weak children survive, and from an early age sons learn the meaning of their personal responsibility for the pride and honour of the family.

Sudden death stands close to the Sarakatsani and they are 156
continually aware of its presence. 'He is behind our ear' (τὸν 884
ἔχουμε στὸ ριζάφτι),[3] they say. Many children die in their early 577
years, childbirth is dangerous, shepherds miss their footing on 761
high ridges or fall into swollen rivers. But the tragic quality of [765]
the death situation is most evident when the pallikari dies for honour. For the young man will lose the perfection of his manliness if he will not on the instant give up his life in the cause of honour. If men must lead their lives according to a pattern of exemplary actions which express a system of agonistic values, the meaning of existence is the freedom to struggle to realize a certain mode of being and honour which, in the case of the pallikari, the Sarakatsani believe to be as near perfection as the determinations of the human condition will allow. Death extinguishes life, and the ability to compete in terms of pride and significance in social life at the very moment when the pallikari is most fit to compete. Death also removes an individual who was closely bound to family and kin; this is part of the tragedy expressed in the funeral dirge. But if death destroys the individual in the pallikari it leaves untouched his 'persona',

---

[3] Cf. Chatzimichalis, op. cit., vol. i, Part A, p. ροη′.

Zagori

156 that part of his personality which, shed of individual traits and
884 circumstances, relates him to the ideal type of manliness that
●577 he has realized in dying for his honour. Dishonour can no longer
761 threaten the dead pallikari. He is free. And it is in their certain
knowledge of this that the women of his family will sing in their
dirge not only of their grief, but also of their pride.

156 After marriage the pallikari becomes the head of family.
577 Now the essential ability demanded of him is that he should
885 be an able protector of his family and his flock. Cleverness
(ἐξυπνάδα) is the quality which he must possesss. It implies a
quickness of mind and a degree of foresight. Such a man is not
caught asleep or off his guard. It implies also the skill to plot
with guile and craft. This appreciation of cleverness is evident
in many stories and anecdotes which are told and retold around
the fire after the evening meal. There is the tale of the shepherd
who had scarcely returned to his huts with a stolen lamb when
he saw a detachment of police approaching along the path.
At once he threw the animal into a baby's cradle, covered it
with a blanket, and ordered his wife to undo her blouse and
give it the breast.

156 Lambros, the leader of a substantial co-operating 'company',
885 has a reputation for craftiness. In 1937, in the winter pastures,
577 he shared a grazing boundary with a family of Albanian
425 Muslims who owned a property of 250 acres. Foreseeing that
at some time in the future these Albanians might be expelled
from Greece, Lambros filed a statement with the court of
First Instance to the effect that he had held a lease of protected
rights over this property since 1929. At the time there was no
reason for the clerk to verify Lambros's statement, since any
attempt to implement a false statement would have been
repudiated with ease by the owners; and Lambros would have
faced a serious charge of perjury. Lambros's foresight was
justified in 1944 when the Muslims fled from Thesprotia.
He was now able to produce his document and in a few weeks
he was duly confirmed in his rights of protected lease over a
property which in fact he had never previously occupied. It is
this kind of subtlety that wins for a man the reputation for
cleverness.

577 It is conceded that a head of household must continually use
885 lies. Lies are not the same as purposeful cleverness, although

they are obviously involved in it. But men lie as a matter of habit and principle to deny other people information. And it is one way of expressing their mutual hostility. A head of family who was sincere (εἰλικρινής), or without cunning words (ντόμπρος), would be considered foolish and neglectful of his duty. 577 885 [578]

This is not to say that the Sarakatsani fail to understand the virtues of truth and sincerity; indeed, relations between kinsmen, or between man and God, are based upon them. But between unrelated men the narrow limits of the human condition, particularly envy and poverty, prescribe opposite and meaner values. The essentially 'fallen' character of these relationships is implicit in linguistic usage. Κακός,[4] bad or evil, is sometimes used to indicate a skilful man, especially in operations where cleverness or cunning is required. Πονηρός, which means cunning in the sense of the worker-out of evil, is very frequently used to describe a man like Lambros whose cleverness has to be grudgingly admitted and admired by other men. And, on the other hand, καλός, good, in contexts of character description often refers to a man who is merely weak and irresolute. 577 609 828 192

But the truly clever man does not give the impression that he is a threat to other men. Except where the interests of his family are critically at stake, he is careful to appear as honourable and well-intentioned towards unrelated men. There are, however, men who practise a small kind of cunning in all their actions. These persons are described as cunning in a sense that is wholly bad. Μάγκας, which means a cunning untrustworthy person, a bearer of mean and untrue scandals, is a word often applied to this kind of man. In the Sarakatsan imagination such a man is small, bent, thin featured, and with narrow close set eyes. The cunning of these men is not the intelligent cleverness of a Lambros, rather it resembles the sexual cunning of women. Both corrupt. The latter corrupts the nobility of men, the former society in general. Cleverness and cunning are legitimate and praiseworthy where their object is the protection or advancement of family interests, but not beyond these limits, or for their own sake. 156 577 828 [192] [826]

The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding 886

---

[4] Cf. Höeg, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 168.

Zagori

156 The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding
577 duties gather in the village square or the coffee-shop. On this
571 public stage the chief representatives of the families of part of
517 the total community appear, and by their attitude and bearing
885 and the recognition and response they accord to one another
they confirm or deny the ideal equality of one family with another. This equality is only maintained by a constant effort of self-assertion. A family head must strut about as if his affairs are of the greatest consequence. His expression is expected to be severe and proud. Modesty in these circumstances is no virtue but a sign of weakness. Ideally, the claims and assertions of other men must be at least equalled, and preferably surpassed. Yet care must be taken not to make a boast which can be proved to be empty. The boaster whose bluff has been called
[521] is despised. Conversation has a sharp, monosyllabic, contrapuntal quality. It is concerned with self-assertion, not with communication or the exchange of information. On these occasions a man must on no account sit quietly in a corner
[525] unspeaking (ἀμίλητος). To withdraw is to admit defeat. Card games often supplement the drinking and the conversation. Although they are games of chance rather than skill, they are acted out with great seriousness. As each man plays his card, this is struck down on to the table with the full force of his open
[578] hand. Quarrels are frequent if one man wins too handsomely and makes facetious or boasting remarks to the losers.

Yet a man ought to combine with this competitive behaviour a generally sociable attitude. The essence of being one of a company (παρέα) is equal sharing. Each man in his turn is expected to buy a round of drinks for the others. Any hint of meanness is enough to brand a man as tight-fisted (σφιχτός), a very serious charge. On the other hand, the man who moves to the other extreme, who spends lavishly and indiscriminately on entertaining others, or gambles recklessly at cards, is also condemned. Such people are known as wasteful spenders (σπάταλοι), without any sense of responsibility towards their families.

885 Caution, moderation, and self-restraint are the qualities
156 demanded of the family head if he is to be a successful steward
577 of his dependants' interests. We have already seen that in
questions of honour the head of the family is unable to hazard himself as freely as his unmarried brother. For similar reasons

Zagori

the self-regard of the head of family is not so sensitive as 885
that of the unmarried man. The man whose quick anger 156
before marriage was approved as showing the spirit of the 577
pallikari, is condemned as irrationally violent (ζουρλός) if,
after his marriage, he draws a knife at the least imagined provo-
cation. The underlying self-restraint of the head of the family, [571]
and the fact that the more volatile unmarried shepherds are
isolated each with his own flock for the greater part of the year,
contribute to a relative degree of peace and order in Sarakatsan
communal life.

The family head must be able to cut a figure at a wedding 156
or a village festival. At a feast he ought to be able to drink 885
continuously without becoming either stupefied or aggressive. 554
To fall asleep even after long hours of dancing, feasting, and 577
drinking, is a mark of weakness. A repertoire of songs, and a
proud upright bearing in the dance, are necessary for a man's
social prestige. Similarly his clothes and appearance on these
occasions are important. A man like Costas Pistiolis with his
unkempt appearance, clothes fouled with dirt, and his inability
to sing or dance, is a figure of mockery at the very few weddings
he attends. Graceless (ἀχάριστος), and unnatural (ἀφύσικος), is
the verdict passed on this wretched man.

Finally, the degree of dependence on, or independence of, 885
others is a factor which differentiates the prestige of heads of 554
family. To be a tselingas, or a member of the dominant sibling 464
group of a co-operative association of families, carries the 465
greatest prestige. The dependence of a man without brothers
on more distant kinsmen is by no means dishonourable, but it
is clearly a situation of less prestige. But the family head who
is forced to watch the sheep of another unrelated Sarakatsanos,
or a villager, for a wage (ρόγα) forfeits any pretension to social
reputation. It suggests that he is so poor that he cannot live
from his flock without the money supplement of the wage,
or that he has no relatives with substantial flocks with whom he
might co-operate, or that he is not acceptable to them. Custom-
arily a shepherd's wage is paid only partly in money, the balance
being given in kind, grain, and a pair of shoes for every six
months of service. The galling feature of becoming a wage
shepherd is the fact of dependence on an unrelated man and
the sense of being a kept man.

Zagori

888 After a man retires from the active arrangement of affairs,
156 which he hands over to his eldest son, he is referred to as the
577 'old man'. He is now expected to become a man who is digni-
[593] fied but quiet (ἥσυχος). He ought to be quiet in the very literal sense that he does not attempt to cross the authority of his son when the latter makes a decision or issues an order. Quarrels between father and son detract from the dignity and prestige of both individuals. But the old man ought also to acquire an inward quietness of spirit, which follows from his release from the worries and cares of leadership and the knowledge that he has reached old age with his reputation for honour untouched. For this reason he ought no longer to possess a sensitive self-regard. For good, or ill, the record of his life will have established his social reputation. Now he ought only to be provoked by extreme insults. Such insults will in any case be judged as wanton and dishonourable, and will rebound on the reputations of those who level them. Normally there is no shame in delivering insults, only in receiving them. But a man of worth does not revile or pick quarrels with women, children, or old men. These categories of persons are inviolable. On the other hand, old men are expected to accept with dignity and good humour the mild affectionate mockery which is directed at them by their juniors.

888 But, although an old man is expected not to interfere in the practical arrangement of everyday affairs, he is listened to with respect in moments of moral crisis. He has passed beyond both the excessive bravadoes of the pallikari, and the cautious calculation of the family head. It is felt that the old man, now near to death, sees the ultimate values in a situation of moral conflict with a clearer eye than do his sons and men of their generation.

561 For women there are also three stages of adult life. The
884 first of these is the category of unmarried girls between the age
582 of sixteen and such time as they are sought in marriage, generally when they are about twenty-five or twenty-six years old.

156 It follows from what has already been said about the relations
577 between the sexes, that the critical quality demanded of the
884 maiden is shame. Just as the freedom from parental responsibi-
831 lities permits the young man to live according to the values of

Zagori

the pallikari, so the fact that she is not yet a wife and mother 156 577 ●
allows the maiden to cultivate her shame which lies in her 884
seclusion from the outside world and the denial of her sexuality. 831
This is scarcely possible for a married woman. Not only must [885]
she submit to her husband's sexual embraces but her practical
duties take her to some extent into the world outside her huts.

The maiden's cultivation of her shame demands that her 156
clothes hide her femininity. Her hair is hidden under a black 884
cotton scarf. A girl who by artifice or accident allows her 834
scarf to become frequently undone gains an evil reputation. 291
The only concession to the display of the hair is that girls grow [302]
their hair long, plaited into pigtails. The length of these pigtails, often artificially increased, is a point of pride and beauty.
Thick, black, homespun blouses and woollen cardigans are
buttoned to the neck and the wrists. The breasts are not supported and the shapeless bodice of the blouse effectively prevents the least hint of a provocative contour. A black woollen
skirt is worn to the ankles. Generally as many as three thick
underskirts are also worn under this. The general impression of
the whole costume is one of shapelessness. The shame which is [515]
felt at the exposure of the body, even when no other person is
present, means that undergarments are not changed for long
periods and the body between the neck and the ankles is never
washed. In contrast the hair is washed at least once a week, [302]
and the face, hands, and feet once or twice each day.

After she reaches the age of sixteen or seventeen a maiden 884
must discipline her movements. No movement even in domestic 156
labour must be hurried. She ought to walk with a slow and 577
deliberate step. In the dance she must not lift her feet more than 834
an inch or two from the ground. A girl who is seen running 481
risks ridicule and a reputation for shamelessness. If, by evil
chance, she were to fall backwards 'with her legs in the air'
(ἀνάσκελα) she would virtually lose her honour. A girl should
be proud but in a sense different from male pride. Thus she [826]
ought to be tall with an upright carriage, but with a gaze which
is downcast, not level, and an expressive attitude which is
directed inwards, not outwards.

A maiden ought to be secluded, as far as this is possible, from 884
the gaze of the outside world. Not only does this guard her 156
name against slander but, if she is unhealthy or ugly, it may 577 834

884 help in deceiving possible suitors. But seclusion is also an
156 element in the cultivation of sexual shame which is essentially
577 hiding and turning inwards thought and facial expression which
834 otherwise become a threat to her own honour and that of
others. It is this knowledge of the powers of her sexuality that
causes her, out of shame, to lower her eyes and withhold a
greeting when she meets a man on a narrow path. It is often
through the eyes that a woman lures a man to disaster. The
[794] attraction need not be consciously exercised. In keeping with
these ideas unmarried girls over sixteen years of age go only
twice a year to church to communicate, at Easter and at the
feast of the Assumption. They are never guests at weddings
which occur outside the immediate neighbourhood and they
do not dance in public at village festivals. A girl in this age
[561] grade is never sent to draw water at the well or to collect
[286] firewood when a brother's wife is available. Ideally, she ought
to spend most of her time preparing her dowry and weaving
cloth at the wooden loom. Such tasks keep her out of the
public gaze. If a girl is seen too often abroad it is soon suggested
[584] that she is being shown off to catch a husband. And in Sarakatsan
thought it is shameful for a girl either personally, or
through her family, to seek a man in marriage, or in any way
to attempt to provoke his desire.

156 Necessarily, the married woman and mother is not able to
577 have as much shame as the maiden. She cannot remain secluded.
834 From time to time she must leave the protective circle of the
huts to fetch water and firewood, milk goats, and rescue her
885 vagrant children. But this is not the same thing as saying that
she may ever act in a shameless fashion. Her clothes must be
as modest as the unmarried girl's and her physical movements,
if they need not be as subdued, must still be carefully controlled.
A careful constraint is the quality she must display in her
public appearances. The Greek word σωφροσύνη, prudence in
the sense of an inner control of feeling and action, although I
have never heard it used by Sarakatsani, seems to express
exactly what is required of the married woman in this respect.
Self-discipline is necessary precisely because she is allowed to
move about more freely and with less supervision. She must
appear modest (σεμνή) and serious in disposition (σοβαρή).
It may be remembered how the unrestrained joking of the wife
of Pistiolis provoked the criticism of other families.

of Pistiolis provoked the criticism of other families. Women 156
must never show emotion in public except where it is con- 885
ventionally expected, as at a death. A married daughter 577
meeting her father for the first time after a serious abdominal 834
operation from which he had not been expected to recover, 152
merely said in a matter of fact voice 'How are you, father?'
A husband does not kiss his wife publicly even in farewell.
Sarakatsan women must never shout in public to each other
or their husbands as do the village women. In childbirth [844]
extreme fortitude is expected. The woman is given a blanket
to bite so that she may not scream; and to guard against the
possibility of outsiders hearing her groans the other women
laugh and talk and, if necessary, beat tin cans. In general, any
lack of self-restraint in conventional behaviour suggests that a
woman may also be without self-control in respect to her sexual
virtue.

There is no need to elaborate again the behaviour expected of 885
a married woman in her roles within the family, qualities such 156
as devotion, humility, and a readiness to co-operate with other 581
women in the group. Physical strength and robustness, rather [826]
than fragile beauty, are the physical characters admired in a
wife and mother. Without strength the woman is unlikely to
survive for long the immense strain of her labours. Health is a [251]
question of deep concern for all Sarakatsani but especially for
the married woman. To be sick is inexcusable, unless it is an
illness that is easily diagnosed and rapidly curable.

As we have seen in an earlier chapter, the woman, especially 885
the mother, expresses the moral solidarity of the family. 156
Women become terrified when they see their men involved in a 593
fight, moaning aloud in their anxiety and continually crossing [152]
themselves. But they are also quick to point the path of duty
when men hesitate. The scorn of a wife, mother, or sister, is
normally more than most men are able to tolerate. When a
man has failed to act honourably a portion of the blame falls to
the women of the family who are said to lack the courage to
shame their men into the right course of action.

But it is in her family that the community chiefly judges the 885
married woman. She must have sons, but one daughter is also 577
desirable. Her own virtues and deficiences will appear in her 828
children, and upon the manliness of her sons and the shame of [842]

Zagori

885
828 her daughters her reputation is dependent, just as the honour
577 of the children is itself contingent on the sexual virtue of their
mother.

888 The final stage of a woman's life is the period between the
596 marriage of her eldest son and her death. She now gains a new
freedom both from the authority of her husband, who retires about this time, and from the restrictions of social convention. She goes freely into shops to make small purchases for the family and may stop to pass the time of day with unrelated men she meets. With a young bride to do the heavy work about the hut she at last finds a respite from constant drudgery, and her sons treat her with a new-found respect as the mistress of
[606] the extended family. Such an old woman should have a kind heart and treat the wives of her sons with firmness but justice. She is their moral guide and practical adviser, to whom they
[844] turn in difficulty or doubt. At childbirth she is the midwife who delivers their children and gives them comfort and courage.

888 The reputation of an old woman is already formed on the
577 basis of her behaviour in earlier life. If she has passed through
554 her life without any questioning of her virtues, if she has sons who are manly, and if she has a kindly personality, the com-
[831] munity probably approves of her. When she is above sixty years of age, or if her husband is dead, the sexuality of woman is considered to be spent and she is said to have a 'clean soul'
[796] (καθαρὴ ψυχή). Such a woman draws the water and kneads the bread which is taken to church at Easter. In these respects the prestige of some old women is considerable.

888 But old women are also feared. Knowledge of magic tech-
754 niques and remedial procedures for the evil eye are attributed
[755] to them; and their curses are believed to be efficient *ex opere operato*. Where old women have a good name they use these skills in a socially approved manner to protect their families from spiritual dangers. But certain old women have a reputation for the evil and aggressive use of these powers. In these
[784] cases there are often allegations of dishonour in earlier life. A
[774] woman who surrenders to lust loses her soul to the Devil and remains his familiar. Envy is often the motive ascribed to
[833] her. Typically she is the woman accused of magically impairing a bridegroom's potency because he did not seek the hand of her own daughter. The attribution of envy often rests on valid

Zagori

The attribution of envy often rests on valid
grounds, for such women come, in the main, from families of 888
low prestige and little material prosperity where difficulties in 754
arranging honourable marriages are almost inevitable. [554] [581]

This completes the description of ideal types. Men and women struggle to identify themselves with the ideal type 156 personality that is appropriate to their sex and time of life. 577 And if a man lives in conformity with these normative ex- 562 pectations of social conduct, he is described as τίμιος, honour- 561 able. Clearly τίμιος, honourable, is a word with considerably wider reference and less specificity than τιμή, honour, since it covers a range of qualities whose applicability is relative to the age and sex of the person described as honourable; while, on the other hand, the values associated with τιμή remain always unchanged. If the head of a family fails to avenge the breaking of his daughter's betrothal because there is no adult son, it may be argued that as an 'honourable' man his inaction is due to his concern to protect his family. But if circumstances of age and family commitments excuse to a degree the loss of honour, nevertheless honour is lost. Opposition of the two concepts 'honour' and 'honourable' is not frequent but, when it does occur, the former is always the significant standard where prestige is concerned.

4. THE HONOURABLE MAN:
NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS

577
626

If the man who is τίμιος, honourable, must attempt to achieve a pattern of ideal conduct, there are also certain negative restrictions on action which he must accept. That these restrictions concern, in almost every case, conduct that wantonly threatens the integrity of the family life is not remarkable when we remember on the one hand the spiritual and material significance of the Sarakatsan family group, and on the other the distrust, hostility, and competition which mark the relations between families that are not related through kinship or marriage.

Scandal which falsely questions the virtue of a maiden is 683
believed to be particularly wicked. It may be easily achieved 156
by only a few allusive remarks, whose author probably succeeds 577
in remaining anonymous. For this reason, perhaps, it is strongly [784]
believed that God will punish those who spread lying scandals.

183 Sometimes, however, the identity of a scandalmonger becomes
156 known. John went to another village to catch a glimpse of the
577 daughter of George Carvounis whom he was considering as a
584 possible bride for his younger brother Demetrios. In the coffee-shop he casually mentioned the girl's name to Michael Goulas who, perhaps guessing the direction of the visitor's interest, told him that the girl was round-shouldered and absent-minded. At first John accepted this statement and without further delay returned to his home: but later he was persuaded by the marriage negotiator that he had been deceived, and after a further visit the marriage contract was eventually arranged. Goulas is relatively prosperous but already had a reputation for meanness and taciturnity. Even before this incident he was an infrequent visitor to the coffee-shop where he was careful to avoid any large gathering in whose company he might have to spend money. Meanness, envy, and unsociability form a pattern of qualities related in Sarakatsan thinking to evil and dishonour. The unsociable man is so because he has something to hide, he hides what he lacks, and what he lacks makes him envious of others. Meanness follows naturally upon envy. Had the poison of his scandal been effective, the crime of Goulas would probably never have become known. In the event, he was condemned and avoided by those who accepted John's version of the incident, and people did not hesitate to describe him as a man without honour (ἄτιμος).

It follows that an honourable man, when he covertly glimpses a prospective bride, is careful never to disclose, except to trusted kinsmen, the true purpose of his visit. For if he decides not to ask for the girl's hand, and this fact becomes public knowledge, people will wonder what flaw he sees in the girl's character and qualities. More generally, it is evil to spread any false scandal which may provoke insult, and response to insult, between other men, and may lead to killings and orphans.

592 The hut or house is inviolable. No stranger may invade it
577 without an invitation. Similarly, whatever takes place within
689 the sanctuary of its walls is private and sacred to the members of the family. This understanding makes possible the warmth, affection, and easy intercourse of family life secluded from the public gaze. It is a sin, and a source of the greatest shame, if a man is caught with his ear to the wall of his neighbour's house

or hut. It is, nevertheless, true that people are insatiably curious 592
about the details of domestic life and relations in other families. 577
The condemnation of eavesdropping, although ideally it points 689
to the recognition of the right of family privacy, in practice
merely places a negative sanction on one particularly blatant
method of obtaining information about other people's affairs.

Men are not honourable who, possessing great physical 577
strength, use it to tyrannize others. They are men who without 683
cause or restraint attack others with insults, using their mothers'
or sisters' names in offensive sexual contexts or uttering other
provocative blasphemies. Such a man, it is believed, purposely
stages an incident to humiliate another who must either lose
honour by not responding, or suffer a physical beating. It is
accepted that, in most instances, to insult another is neither
avoidable nor dishonourable. A sheep strays across a boundary,
another shepherd stones it, its owner insults him, blows are
exchanged. This sequence of events is to be expected in a community where the interests of different families conflict and
each man must maintain his self-regard and the honour of the
family. But wanton and unprovoked outrage is evil.

There are, also, categories of persons whom it is always dishonourable for a man to assault: women, old men, young
boys, and children, persons weaker than himself. A man who
interferes with women, or picks a quarrel with an old man or a
young boy, quickly loses his social reputation. It sometimes 626
occurs that, when grazing land is disputed, a family will send its
sheep under the guard of a young shepherd boy into the disputed area, knowing that the other shepherd will not improve
his case with the community, the villagers, or the police, if he
strikes the youth. However, this is a dangerous tactic since, if the
young shepherd is struck, honour demands retaliation.

There is one other category of persons that a man must not 577
exploit, the very poor. Whereas a Sarakatsanos will not hesitate 735
to trick or deceive other men, it is not honourable to take
advantage of a very poor man with only twenty or thirty animals, particularly if he has a young family. It is the very fact of
his dependence on the generosity and forbearance of those of
greater power and prestige that morally prevents them from
exploiting him. In the face of the implicit admission of his
failure in life they cannot press home their advantage. Since

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

577 735 he has failed to provide adequately for his children, others must assume a responsibility not to make their humiliating condition worse. If men oppress the very poor of their own community, there is an element of hubris in their conduct that respects neither God nor the family which is His institution.

577 576 In general, where the interests and honour of a family are not affected, every effort ought to be made to avoid giving needless affronts to others. When people pass in hailing distance, conventional greetings must be carefully exchanged. When he is asked for some information which he does not wish to give, or when he is requested to do something which he does not wish to do, a man ought not to reply with a curt negative; rather he should answer in the one case with polite and elaborate evasions, and in the other with a declaration of his willingness to help, balanced by a list of insurmountable difficulties which, nevertheless, he will struggle to overcome. Within the limit of his pride a man ought always to appear sociable and concerned. These prescriptions are not entirely prudential. [828] There is a consciousness of common humanity. Competitive hostilities prevent men from expressing this feeling except in the marginal areas of social life; but to ignore it entirely is not only socially dangerous, but it denies the essential nobility and generosity of man and provokes the anger of God.

577 626 The community, then, places certain bounds on the expression of hostility. They are not very onerous limitations, but clearly there may often exist doubt, in the evaluation of a man's conduct, as to whether he has overstepped the limit of permissible hostility and, thus, has lost his reputation for acting as an honourable man. Inevitably the duty to further family interests, and the limitation on the expression of hostility, conflict in certain circumstances.

156 577 829 Ideally, it is maintained, a man ought to go beyond the negative prescriptions contained in the notion of the honourable man; he ought also to be positively concerned about the interests and honour of an unrelated man, he ought to be φιλότιμος, caring for, or loving, his honour. That is to say he ought to be so intensely concerned about the nobility of his own conduct that he takes into account how his actions affect the honour and prestige of others. It is still an essentially self-regarding attitude, but the acute concern about the purity of

Zagori

his own motives spills over into an incidental concern for 156
others. Such a man, it is said, will resist the approaches of a 577
woman even where she clearly wishes to be seduced, and where 829
there is no danger of discovery. He never uses lies or deceit to
trick another man, or takes advantage of a situation to make
another look foolish. A Sarakatsanos when defending his
conduct will often say, 'I am a man who loves honour'. But
others will not accept this estimate of self. Φιλότιμος is an epi-
thet never attributed by one Sarakatsanos to another un-
related shepherd, because they believe that the responsibilities
which each individual owes to the family group absolutely
preclude his acting in this manner. On the other hand, it is [571]
not infrequently used to characterize a patron whose protec-
tion is effective; for here interests are complementary, not
opposed, and in the particular context of the patron-client
relationship it is possible for a man of power to appear to be
acting in this way towards his client. And, in a condescending
sense, it is possible for a patron to admit the same quality in
his client.

* * *

Three concepts, 'honour' (τιμή), 'honourable' (τίμιος), 156
and 'loving honour' (φιλότιμος), have now been considered 577
in their relation to the community's evaluation of a man's
conduct and its implicit recognition of his prestige. Although
τίμιος and φιλότιμος indicate, in different degrees, some con-
cern about other men, all three are essentially self-regarding
terms. In each case it is a question of a man attempting to
realize a particular ideal pattern of conduct. What interests
him is the success of this quest, not the effect of his actions on
others.

The quality of being honourable has this in common with 156
honour, that most men are assumed to have it. It is not some- 577
thing which must be competed for, but something which must 828
not be lost. Although there is certainly the need constantly to
re-achieve standards of conduct, the emphasis is on the fact
that most Sarakatsani have honour, and are honourable, but
that individuals, to a greater or less degree, may stray from the
path of normative virtue and lose their prestige.

Both the concepts of honour and of the honourable man [591]

Zagori

156 577 828 591 assume, ideally, a community in which all families are equal in their possession of honour, and all men are equal in the honourable discharge of the duties associated with their social roles. Although a Sarakatsanos seldom explicity attributes prestige to another, and struggles always to find some failings in another's character when he discusses him, yet by the recognition that he gives another in public life, by the way he shares conversation and drinking companionship, he may implicity admit him to a position of equality. A man may also talk or drink with a person he considers to be of inferior prestige, but there are fine nuances of attitude which make this difference between them very clear. If this evaluation of prestige is acceptable to the general community the man who is treated as an inferior will receive no public backing if he chooses to interpret this treatment as a slight, and reacts to it violently.

156 577 183 558 The flagrant breaking of social norms leads to the withdrawal of recognition and response, that is to a definitive loss of prestige. After it became known that Goulas had falsely denigrated the daughter of George Carvounis he appeared even more infrequently in public, an admission of his shame and humiliation. When he did enter the coffee-shop people greeted him unenthusiastically, if an exchange of greetings was unavoidable; but nobody engaged him in conversation, or bought him a drink. His presence was tolerated, but he was tacitly expelled from the intimacies of social life. He was no longer an equal in honour.

156 577 626 Conformity is the chief defence against denigration where people believe that the hostile criticism of others protects in some way their own reputation. Moreover the precision of this criticism is considerable since the social roles which a man or woman assumes at any period of life are few in number, and their implications are perfectly understood both by the protagonists and those who observe them. Yet it would be too simple a judgement to think that the concepts of honour and the honourable man depend only on the external sanctions of competition or mutual hostility. For the Sarakatsani believe that these ideals and values, which breathe meaning, purpose, and value into their lives, require no justification or sanction. They are a way of life, not a code of interdictions.

577 But even social conformity does not necessarily protect

Zagori

reputations. Honour and prestige depend, also, on other 577
factors besides the possession, or apparent possession, of
personal qualities. We turn now to a discussion of these other
factors.

5. THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS IN PRESTIGE

The elements of prestige we now discuss differ from those that 554
have just been described in that they emphasize, not the ideal 577
equality of honourable men, but the inevitable inequalities
which differentiate families in terms of numbers and wealth
and certain other criteria. Whereas the concepts of honour and
the honourable man are purely social facts, the elements of
prestige we are about to examine are clearly not; they involve
demographic and ecological factors, and chance.

(A) NUMBERS

Ὄγκος means mass and, by extension, social influence. The 554
Sarakatsani often use the word to refer to the numerical strength 596
of the family, particularly the number of sons or brothers. It is
noticeable that in folk-songs and folk-tales the pallikari is
typically one of five brothers, or more. The ideal type hero
is never an only son. To have many sons is the crowning pride [842]
of a man's life, and conversely, sterility, and to a less degree a
family of girls, is a mark of failure.

That a strong and united group of brothers supports a family's reputation is wholly understandable. They are able effectively to guard its interests by physical force, they are not necessarily dependent on others for co-operation in the management of their flocks and, until the extended family is divided, there is at least one unmarried brother prepared to revenge its honour. Other men think twice before they offend a shepherd with four or five brothers.

At the other extreme, the man without brothers, or the 554
father without sons, is weak. A man without a brother may be 577
killed with less fear of revenge than is generally probable, a 596
girl without a brother runs a greater risk of insult or a broken
marriage contract than do other unmarried women. For in
these circumstances the only person under any formal obligation to retaliate is the father, a man of advancing years who is isolated in his family without the active support of other men,

554 577 596 and fearful that he may leave his dependants without a protector. But although the predicament of a man in this position is appreciated by other Sarakatsani, it scarcely mitigates the loss of prestige. If a man has no adult son to protect his daughter's virtue, the fault is his. For weakness is despised. In itself it tends to diminish the prestige of a family even before it has [156] led to dishonour. And men who are isolated without brothers or sons are noticeably less proud, less confident, and in some cases are, by Sarakatsan standards, pathetically diffident and nervous—overt personality traits which I have not observed in men born into large sibling groups with a number of brothers.

(B) WEALTH

59 554 556 Τὸ βιό is the property owned by a family, particularly its flocks of sheep and goats, the mules and horses. Although money invested in other objects of prestige such as village houses is important, animals in a pastoral community are the significant form of wealth and a critical element in social reputation.

Today there are few families that own more than five hundred [235] sheep and goats. A household with more than 150 animals holds a respectable position in the community, one with 80 to 120 animals is on the brink of poverty, while a group with less than 40 animals is despicably poor. Yet the question of wealth is not quite so simple as this arithmetical scale might suggest. The Myriounis extended family of five brothers have 476 animals. Only the flocks of two other families in the Neochori local group exceed theirs in size. So long as they remain a single family with this large flock and five adult men to serve and protect it, the family is clearly, in this respect, a group of high prestige among the Neochori shepherds and indeed in the total community. But when the family is forced to divide into a group of autonomous families, each brother will possess only 80–90 sheep and goats; it may, therefore, seem that at a single stroke they will fall from one end of the wealth-prestige scale to the other. In fact, however, so long as the families of a group of brothers hold together in a co-operative association, folding their sheep together in a single flock (although with different ear-signs), they continue to derive some prestige from the aggregate number of their animals. Still it will now be said, for instance, that Theodoros has only 80 sheep and goats of his

Zagori

For pride,

554 [585] again, the dowry of the bride is formally presented article by article to the assembled guests, first at the bride's home, and afterwards at the home of the groom.

The display of pride is an important element in prestige but it must itself be based on reality. The pride of a Sarakatsanos may always be disproportionate in the view of other men but when it is wholly false it leads only to mockery.

* * *

183 577 554 The elements of prestige have been divided into two categories. The first category emphasizes the ideal equality, in the community, of families and individuals of the same sex and age group. Their ideal equality rests on the belief that most Sarakatsani have honour and are honourable, that they struggle to achieve in their lives ideal patterns of conduct. These elements of prestige require of the individual man or woman constant effort and self-discipline. An idea of the essential nobility of the Sarakatsani underlies them. The second category of elements of prestige are factors which to a considerable degree lie beyond the power of the individual, or even the group, to alter. They are all factors (numbers, wealth, leadership of co-operating groups, opportunities to show hospitality, lineage, marriage alliances, and the effective display of pride) which far from positing the ideal equality of families lead inevitably to their differentiation in terms of prestige. And, necessarily, they are caught up in ideas of fate, envy, and the fallen condition of this world.

The two categories of elements of prestige are nevertheless interdependent and both must figure in the evaluation of a family's total prestige. Without the imputation of honour and the quality of being honourable, wealth and numbers only represent a prestige which is, at best, equivocal. And weakness, or poverty, draws in its train doubts about the honour of a family, however socially conformist it may be.

6. THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES

156 558 One sanction for the conduct, qualities, and achievements that have been presented as elements in the prestige of an individual, or a family, is the simple fact of the loss of this

156 in the eyes of others, and how their evaluation of himself relates to the ideal image of how he would wish to appear. Clearly, the more the publicity that surrounds any particular area of social life, the greater is the efficacy of the sentiment of self-regard as a sanction of approved qualities and conduct.

156 A man's self-regard is typically molested where he is in-
577 sulted or defamed or believes himself to be so treated. When
578 another person suggests by even indirect allusion that a man is dishonourable or weak he molests his self-regard (προσβάλλει τὸν ἐγωϊσμό του). Or when a man by deed, or word, behaves towards another in such a way as to suggest that he is not worthy of consideration and recognition, he again molests his self-regard; for a man only acts in this way towards another when he considers him to be of lesser reputation and, by inference, less honourable. In such circumstances the core of a man's social personality is touched, his manliness and prepotence are questioned. Then, the only remedy is to attack his detractors with knife or stick.

There are many instances of such a situation. The stoning of a sheep by another shepherd when it has strayed across a boundary. An unguarded public remark which the recipient judges others will consider to be an unanswered insult if he
156 does not retaliate. It is, in part, self-regard which urges the
577 abduction of a girl when a candidate bridegroom has been
583 refused by the girl's father. Christos Kazoukas was refused the hand of the daughter of Paschos. She was too young, the girl's father said, and as she was, indeed, only twenty-two, Christos was prepared to accept this explanation rather than undertake the dangerous business of abduction. But George Carvounis, a second cousin to Christos, heard a different tale that the girl's family had refused Christos because it was said that he was sexually impotent and inadequate. In fact, the girl's mother had dubbed him by a nickname, 'Lame penis' (κουτσοπούτσα), which referred literally to these supposed short-comings. Christos had a smooth skin, fine features and a strikingly high-pitched voice. Simply, he did not look the part
628 of a pallikari. There was, therefore, all the greater urgency that he should reply to these damning allegations; for the
612 alternative was ridicule and shame. His kinsmen offered united moral support and the unspoken threat of abandonment if he did nothing.

he did nothing. In due course, the girl was abducted and 156
agreed to marry Christos out of terror at the threats made by 577
the Kazoukas family against her own people if she did not [583]
consent.

Self-regard is a subjective and personal sentiment. At the same time the situations which provoke it are socially defined. All those elements of prestige, whether of the individual or the family, affect it and are sanctioned by it. A man's self-regard leads him to conserve his honour, to act honourably, to strive after wealth, to act proudly and arrogantly and so on. Self-regard inhibits any conduct on which an interpretation of
weakness may be placed. For instance, the Sarakatsani seldom [578]
accept or give apologies. 'A pardon is not acceptable' (δὲν
πιάνεται τὸ παρντόν), it is said. Similarly, bargaining between [437]
a shepherd and a livestock merchant is extremely difficult because the self-regard of the seller will not allow him to accept a price which he thinks other men will laugh at, even though he may admit to himself that in relation to the state of the market and the condition of his stock the merchant's offer is not unreasonable. For this reason a merchant employs a Sarakatsanos[*] who from his local knowledge advises him how far each man may be pressed in negotiation. It is also his task to
assure the shepherd that he has made a good bargain. It is [627]
self-regard, again, that prevents a Sarakatsanos from reaching a settlement out of court when his animals have trespassed on
other people's land. He prefers to go to law knowing in advance [691]
that he must pay double the costs of a private agreement. Any compromise would be an admission of weakness in a personal
confrontation. Defeat in the courts, on the other hand, is [648]
merely defeat by the power of the impersonal State apparatus, which in any case, it is agreed, is corrupt and inimical to the interests of the community.

Self-regard is a kind of appetitive tension between what a 156
man is and what he ought to be. In this context, however, what a man is depends on the evaluation by the community of what a man is alleged to be, or to have done. The need of a man, socially and psychologically, to identify the community's evaluation of himself with his own ideal image is so great that

---

[*] Known as a κολαοῦζος, a guide.

156 it leads, very often, to a greater concern with appearances than reality. Or, rather, appearances become reality. In the appearance of being a pallikari, he becomes a pallikari. There is often a kind of unconscious cheating. A man boasts and asserts himself the more when there is little fear that he may be called on to prove himself. And knives are pulled with greater bravado when it is certain that others are present to prevent their use.

152 If self-regard is the need to achieve an identity with the image
156 of an ideal self, shame is the emotion experienced by an
● 577 individual when he clearly fails to do so. As in the case of self-regard, although a man may feel shame for short-comings or sufferings that remain secret, it involves at all times some idea of comparison with the achievements of others, and it is all the more acute when a man's inadequacy is publicly exposed. A man may feel shame not only for his own short-comings, but also for those of other persons with whom he is closely identified in any situation. And it may also be a sentiment imputed by others when they make critical comments on a man's behaviour or condition. They may say that his conduct in a particular situation is a matter for shame, that is, if he were an honourable man, his sense of shame would have prevented him from acting in the way that he did.

Like self-regard, shame is a sanction for all those elements that are relevant to the prestige of a family, or an individual. Thus shame relates not only to conduct which is morally bad, but also to any kind of conduct which is only conventionally deviant. And anything which leads to, or is the basis of, low prestige is a matter for shame. Whatever may be the underlying psychological character of shame, its cultural definition amongst the Sarakatsani is the sense or fear of failure. The failure exists to the extent that a man does not possess some attribute required by the image of his ideal self. When a man acts disgracefully he hurts himself. When he is poor or weak, by suffering this condition he condemns himself. And the sense of shame, an essentially internal sanction of action, is related to the external threat of social abandonment, the fear that the community will judge him to be 'lost' (χαμένος).

A number of examples illustrate the relation between shame and failure. When Nasios attempted to seduce a

married woman he showed that he was not honourable and, 152
further, by hiding in his hut he revealed his cowardice and 156
exposed his manliness to public ridicule. He failed to measure 577
up to the critical qualities required of a man; this was a matter for shame. The young son of Pistiolis, who possesses only sixty sheep, told me that on migrations the family is so ashamed of its poverty that it delays its departure until a few days after the other Sarakatsani have left the village. 'Otherwise people would see how poor we were and would laugh at us.' Eleutherios has a small son who is subject to fits. His brother [784]
admitted that this was a matter for shame because people would say that God was punishing the child for its parents' sins. It is a mark of indelible parental failure if children are spotted by any moral or physical blemish. A modest maiden has shame in two respects. She is aware of the power of her sexuality; in a sense she has already failed by being a woman at all, and for this she 'feels shame'. She is also a girl 'with shame' in the sense that she carefully conforms to a strict code of modest behaviour and movement. This expresses the fear of failure in disciplining sexuality according to the ideal pattern of maidenly conduct. Finally, a little child feels shame before a stranger because it lacks experience of a situation it does not understand. It fears failure and criticism. 'The child is ashamed. He does not understand yet,' says the father.

These different contextual situations in which the concept of shame is used are linked by the notion of failure, or fear of failure, whether the emphasis on inadequacy is internal to the social personality, producing feelings of self-disesteem, or whether, as is more often the case, these sentiments are made more acute through public loss of prestige. The laughter, ridicule, and insults actually experienced, or more often imagined, are the marks of failure so far as the external reference of shame is concerned. Between the two sanctions of right conduct, self-regard, and shame, there is a close affinity. While self-regard is the positive incentive to achieve what is expected, shame is the fear, or the realization, of not achieving it. This [562]
difference of emphasis is reflected in the fact that to some extent these two sentiments are sex-linked. The idea of self-regard 156
contains the notion of a positive competitive attitude, especially 562
between men of similar age and standing. Women do not go

7. A SYSTEM OF VALUES

571 577 Sarakatsan society offers men only three important corporate memberships: in the family, the local community, and the nation. Little conflict arises between the obligations created by these different commitments. The interests of the family are normally contained within the purposes of the community when it faces other communities, those of the community are contained within the aims of the nation opposed to the rest of the world. In war, the actions of a soldier reflect simultaneously on the honour of his family, his community, and his nation. And in each instance the honour and interests of the individual and of the group are mutually implicated.

Honour refers to an exclusive identification. The honour of a group is opposed to the honour of another if only for the reason that there is an implicit comparison between different honours in reference to a pattern of ideal attributes. But honour also reflects on the correct status relations between individuals or groups. When two groups are in communication the behaviour of the persons representing them implies, on either side, a certain evaluation of the other group. If a man suffers treatment that is less than his due, his honour, and the honour of the group he represents, are diminished. But in the experience of the Sarakatsani the interests and prestige of families, communities, and nations are inevitably in collision, and this must lead men to exploit others where they can. Thus relations between different groups always carry the threat of the depreciation of the honour of one for the benefit of the other. Although relations between families, communities, and nations refer, ideally, to an equality in honour, yet at each level those who represent these groups must struggle with all their resources of courage and self-discipline to maintain these ideal status relations. These struggles are intense. And in every significant context of action the world is necessarily divided with dramatic definition into own people and strangers, friends and enemies. Consequently relationship radically [609] affects the forms of approved behaviour. It is a virtue generally to cheat, deceive, and lie to non-kinsmen, but the same conduct towards kinsmen would be shameful and, often, sinful as well. The values of honour and prestige are exclusive and

Zagori

particularist. They have a moral content of their own but they 571
cannot be referred to any universal moral principle. 577

For the Sarakatsani, family honour is the chief concern. 571
Indeed, the honour of community or nation is, in their view, 577
a projection of the concept of family honour. This honour is 59
shared in two senses; intensively, by those whose reputation is identified by their membership in the same family; extensively, by the community of families sharing in common a system of values by which they judge one another's position and performance. Honour depends not upon the consciences of the individuals in a family whose reputation is under scrutiny, but on the concessions and reluctant approval of other families. Most of these are unrelated and hostile. Since the threat of denigration is continuous, it must be balanced by the repeated exhibition of those qualities that support honour and prestige: self-assertive courage in men, modest virtue in women. In the one case by social convention, in the other by its negative character, the presence of these qualities is more often revealed by attitudes and appearances than substantive proof. There is an emphasis on opinions and appearances, not facts. The consequences of action rather than the intentions behind it are important. This does not mean that private shame for undiscovered failure does not exist. But, inevitably, ideas about individual moral responsibility are blurred, and undiscovered shame is not as morally serious as public disgrace.

Reputation is impossible without strength. Poverty is a [235]
mark of failure, not a virtue. Strength in sheep and in men encourages others to respect a family's honour, it attracts dependent kinsmen whose support further extends influence and prestige. Honour and strength are linked. If a family is without sons the call of honour may find a man in the dilemma that if honour is lost the moral existence of the family collapses, or if honour is vindicated his family becomes a leaderless group of women and children dependent on the generosity of kinsmen, a condition which must eventually affect prestige and, perhaps, honour as well. Honour, and the obligation to die for it, is the ideal value, but the sacrifice necessarily weakens the family. Honour remains integral, but becomes more vulnerable. A family needs at least one man in the role of unmarried brother whose unreflecting courage guards its

Zagori

571 honour, and one man in the role of married leader whose
577 prudence and self-control secures its material strength. This
59 possibility depends on the number of sons in a family and the stage of its development. Yet in the critical and unfriendly view of others a family must always be in a position to defend itself against outrage. Weakness is shameful and circumstances never excuse it. The corollary to this notion is that, within limits, it is normally preferable to insult than to be insulted, to exploit than to be exploited.

577 The emphasis on strength appears in the importance, in
167 moral judgements, of health, effectiveness (δραστηριότης), skill and cleverness. Skill conserves material strength; animals are less likely to become diseased, inferior pastures are not chosen. A man ought to be 'able' in the sense of able to provide, and he needs cleverness of the kind that foresees future threats
[734] in time. Health is imperative in this scheme of things; chronic
[232] sickness or deformity is inexcusable. There is little sentimentality. Questions of honour are not complicated by notions of
[622] chivalrous conduct. An honour killing is accomplished without warning by a bullet fired from behind cover, or a knife in the back. This does not mean that Sarakatsani are cowards; they are, in fact, immensely brave. But, continually, the accent is on effective action, the achievement of success, the avoidance of failure. Ends matter more than means. Consequently, those qualities and attributes that are necessary for strength tend to be considered as morally good, those that lead to weakness as morally bad. Sarakatsani would condemn any display of excessive altruism on the grounds that it inevitably weakens a person's own family and strengthens the family of another; it would be, at best, imprudent, and in a situation where it clearly damaged the interests of the family it would be immoral.

156 Strength and prowess, then, matter more than ethical good-
577 ness. Indeed a man is only good when he is also by implication, able and strong. Although aimless violence is dishonourable there is no missing the pleasure it gives when a man is forced to kill; nor the prestige which it brings him. For there is no more conclusive way of showing that you are stronger than by taking away the other man's life.

[562] The form of this system of values is related to three features of the social structure: the first of these is the complementary

opposition of the sexes. It is consistent with the radical character 156
of this opposition that most virtues are sex-linked. Since the 577
sensuality of sex is a critical flaw in human nature, chastity 562
becomes an important element in honour, around which those [831]
complementary virtues, the self-assertive qualities of the men, the modest constricted virtues of the women, are organized in defence. At the same time the moral superiority of the male sex in this opposition allows the main burden of the responsibility for original sin to be borne by the woman in a way that does not compromise the inherent nobility of man which is, necessarily, a premise of a system of values based on ideas of honour. And the complementary opposition of the two sexes and their ideal attributes allows the introduction of those quieter feminine virtues of love, modesty, and a disposition to co-operate, without inconsistency in relation to the self-assertive male values, and in the context of inner family life where they are most necessary to express the moral solidarity of the family and support those who face a hostile and competitive world.

The second relevant feature of social structure is the solidarity 156
of the family, and the categorical nature of obligations between 577
its members. This solidarity is both active and passive. What- 59
ever is done or suffered by one member equally affects the honour and shame of the others. No actor stands in isolation without reference to his membership in a family. He carries always a weight of representative responsibility when his actions are observed or even speculated on by others. And, on the other hand, the family is a small group in which there is no security of anonymity when other members fail. In these circumstances, where there is individual responsibility but no certainty of individual justice, important values are variations on the theme of strength and weakness, success and failure. Without self-confidence, prepotence, and skill, a man is 'lost' (χαμένος) morally as well as practically.

The relationships of hostility between families unconnected 577
by ties of kinship or marriage are the third feature of social 578
structure. They are oppositions consistent with a particular form of bilateral kinship system, and the absence of any forms of political or economic co-operation other than those based on relationship or patronage. These potentially destructive

577 confrontations are reconciled through the acceptance of
578 competition for prestige as the end of individual and family
purpose. For it turns men's minds from thoughts of the physical
destruction of their enemies to the alternative of their social
humiliation, a form of opposition more compatible with the
156 vulnerable quality of the shepherd's life. At the same time these
577 particular values, if they deny the practicability of universal
moral principles and individual justice, present an
image of man that is in some ways heroic and not ignoble.
Men must be brave and women virtuous to achieve ideal, one
might say mythical, forms of acting and being. They are
encouraged in the need to discipline their weaknesses by the
severity of their mutual criticism; roles are few, and values
unambiguous in a common field of experience. But judgements
concern the effectiveness of the total social personality,
an amalgam of virtues, skills, and material attributes; and not
abstract qualities of moral excellence.

571 In competitive institutions, although feelings of hostility
577 may remain unabated, opposition becomes a form of mutual
dependence; the more men are opposed in this way, the more
they have need of one another. The values of prestige recommend
the intense consideration of own interests and honour,
accentuating always the exclusiveness and separation of one
family from another. Yet they also impose the condition that
prestige depends on the attentions and opinions of others. They
separate; and, at the same time, they create a necessary and
close interdependence in the common membership of a
community in honour.

[p.321]

XI

THE VALUES OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF

1. GOD AND SIN

I do not propose to discuss in any detail the ritual practices 121
of Sarakatsan religious life, nor the peripheral complex 771
of magic techniques which are sometimes linked to religious 577
beliefs and sometimes not. My purpose is to indicate the general character of Sarakatsan religious conceptions and to show in what way a form of Christian belief may co-exist with the values of honour and prestige that were examined in the previous chapter.

In certain respects the relationship of the Sarakatsani to the 794
Greek Orthodox Church, as an institution, is tenuous. They have never been regular churchgoers. Before 1938 their huts were often far from villages and few adult men and women would have been able to escape from the imperative routines of family and flocks to make the long journey over difficult
country. And since they have come to live in or near the vil- [148]
lages, the almost open ridicule and contempt of the villagers have discouraged the Sarakatsani from altering this traditional pattern.

When a Sarakatsanos goes to church he normally does so 796
with the intention of taking Holy Communion, and this he 794
ought to do, preferably, twice a year. During Easter week almost every man, woman, and child in the community will find a means of attending one of the services, and the majority will discover an opportunity to communicate again later in the year on the feast day of the Assumption of the All Holy Mother of God on 15th August, or at Christmas, or at one of the other more important festivals of the Church.

The Eucharist, in the simple way that they understand it as 779
the sacrifice of Christ's blood which overcomes the barrier of sin separating man from God, is the central belief of Sarakatsan religious life. Otherwise, when they attend a service they understand nothing of the structure of the liturgy, they do not know that the liturgy is a symbolic representation of the life and sacrifice of Christ. Only the shorter and more frequently

Zagori

776 781 escape from the omnipotence of God and the futility of resistance, yet his humility is not entirely unconditional.

783 Man is noble but between him and God there is always a barrier of sin. Sarakatsani express this in the idea of 'a weight' (ἕνα βάρος) which depresses the spirit and in a literal sense draws man downwards away from God. The Sarakatsani, however, make a distinction between two kinds of sin, personal sin (οἱ ἁμαρτίες μας) and ancestral sin (οἱ ἁμαρτίες τοῦ 'Αδάμ). Both divide man from God but while the individual is wholly responsible for personal sins, he feels little sense of guilt for the other kind of sin which he sees as a pre-existing condition of the world into which he was born.

The sins for which a man is individually responsible fall into three categories. The first includes those acts which are wanton and personal insults to God Himself, acts in which a man shows himself to be impious (ἀσεβής) through a denial or mockery of God. Perjury is the greatest of these; for in this act a man calls upon God to witness the truth of his words, that is, he attempts the impossible task of implicating God as a collaborator in his lie. [577] Although the Sarakatsanos lies as a matter of habit and policy at other times, it is only in situations of great difficulty that he will perjure himself.

783 829 59 The second category of personal sins relates to family life, and especially to certain fundamental and axiomatic attitudes and duties on which the moral solidarity of the family institution is based. The family for the Sarakatsanos is not merely a human and social group, it is a complex of relations divinely instituted and sanctioned by God. On a transcendent and spiritual plane, the Holy Family of God the Father, the Mother of Christ, and Christ the Son, is the archetype for all earthly families. As love, respect, compassion, relate the three Holy Persons, so these qualities ought to regulate the relations of the members of earthly families. Where this is not so there is a condition of 783 sin and God's punishment may be expected. Thus this category of sins includes the unnecessary brutality of fathers towards small children; provoking a premature separation of sons' households; laziness or dereliction of duty which leads a family into serious want; in that sense, gambling or chronic drunkenness; public insult to a parent by a son or daughter; maltreatment of aged parents; striking a parent; physical violence

783 holds any real terror for the Sarakatsanos, but rather the
784 spiritual death which precedes physical death. For sin interrupts
771 the communion between man and God on whose provision and protection a man and his family are, in the final analysis, entirely dependent. The consistency between this view of divine punishment and the system of prestige values is clear enough. In both cases it is the events of this life, and this world, which are significant.

783 But the Sarakatsani do not expect to be punished individu-
● 577 ally in the same way for ancestral sin. For this kind of sin refers to the general human condition not to individual transgression of particular interdictions. The two sins they particularly include under this rubric are sensuality and envy. Both are conditions which imply an attachment to material things which leads man away from God. And it is equally inevitable that every man must succumb, in some degree, to both these sins. However, the attitude to sensuality and envy is not precisely the same. The consequences of sensuality, as we have seen elsewhere, destroy the integrity and honour of the family. Sensuality is a condition which constantly threatens to undermine this institution from within. It must, therefore, be disciplined by all the strength and will of each man and woman.
[828] But unlike the protestant puritan who attempts to win his battle by destroying sensuality itself, and feels individually responsible and guilty when he fails, the Sarakatsanos accepts that sensuality is part of the human condition, but that he must struggle to contain and discipline it. The important
[834] restraints are essentially external. Unmarried men and women who are not kinsmen or affines have few legitimate opportunities to meet, and none to speak to one another. The unmarried daughter seldom goes to the well alone, and when she passes a man on the path she lowers her eyes. It is a tight prudential control, collectively exercised. For, as the Sarakatsani say, 'If you put your hand in the fire, it gets burnt'. A man of God may win an individual and inward control over the condition of sensuality, but ordinary men need the help of kinsmen and the support of institutions in the unequal fight. Sensuality is part of ancestral sin and as such a man or woman does not feel individually guilty for its existence. But it remains a threat to honour. And in this respect the struggle to control it is so

Zagori

And in this respect the struggle to control it is so
fundamental to the belief in their own nobility that, in a com- 783
munity where masculine values are paramount, it has led 577
the Sarakatsani to a form of sexual dualism in which women 562
must bear the main responsibility for this collective sin; a responsibility, however, which is not to be confused with individual guilt.

Envy does not threaten the family in the same way from 783
within, nor does it conflict with the values of honour and pride. 152
Indeed, the emphasis on competitive values, the need to achieve 156
identity with ideal types of social personality, the competitive opposition of family groups, are social values and relationships which inevitably breed envy. Like the fingers on a hand, all men are not the same, Sarakatsani explain. Those who are less fortunate, or less evidently honourable, must envy those others who surpass them. Envy, they admit, leads directly to deceit
and cunning. In the form of the evil eye it is a force of psychic [754]
hostility and wickedness that pervades the world, spiritually separating man from man, and man from God. Focused though the eyes of an envious man, it may create physical effects of sickness and destruction. These things, it is agreed, are evil, but they arise from the external conditions of a world of limited resources and contrary human wills, not from the conscious sinfulness of individual men. The force of envy is felt to be so pervasive that it would be futile to struggle to control it, as one must struggle to control sensuality; particularly since a man may put the evil eye on another without conscious knowledge or intention. All that an honourable man can do is to avoid in his conscious actions the consequences of excessive
envy. For the observer the difference between the ancestral [577]
sins of sensuality and envy is that while the former compromises honour, the latter, in a certain sense, is a consequence of it. Naturally, the Sarakatsani do not see the distinction in quite this form.

The difference between personal and ancestral sin is not 783
unrelated to the distinction between the Sarakatsan senses of 828
guilt and shame. Both guilt and shame are internal states of conscience but whereas shame is concerned with a man's failure to approach some ideal pattern of conduct, the reference of guilt and personal sin is to the transgression of interdicted limits. Shame relates to failure especially in comparisons with

Zagori

754 members have an obvious reason to be envious of other people. 232 They may also be persons from respected families who suffer some personal disability or deformity; for instance, a powerful eye is attributed to a prosperous Skamneli villager who has a squint and a club-foot.

754 596 Generally, however, the question whether the evil eye of any person is to be attributed to unconscious witchcraft or intentional sorcery depends upon his relationship to the victim. Since small children are often bewitched, it is not remarkable that in extended families the tensions which exist between the wives of brothers are often reflected in the regular presence of the name of the husband's brother's wife among those suspected by the mother of a sick child. But it is always accepted that such bewitching is of the unconscious kind, as indeed are almost all instances of evil eye between kinsmen and affines. On the other hand, where the bewitcher is an unrelated person the victim is ready to ascribe more conscious motives to the possessor of the eye that has hurt him.

152 754 It is not, of course, strange that the envy of the evil eye is associated with the Devil. Envy is inherent in the material world of limited resources and numerous contrary wills. Lacking what another possesses and thinking of that rather than of his relation to God, a man is easily led by the Devil to destroy what he himself has not. This tendency is so inherent in the nature of the situation that, as we have seen, even kinsmen and affines bewitch one another, although such is the strength of the moral element in these relationships that the effects are not believed to be produced with conscious intention. 152 554 577 And it is interesting to note that of the elements of prestige which were discussed in the previous chapter, those elements, honour and the quality of being honourable, which tend towards the ideal equality of members of the community and the conception of the Sarakatsani as men united in the desire to live in accordance with honour, do not of themselves necessarily lead to envy between men, for they are essentially spiritual values; on the other hand, those elements of prestige which inevitably differentiate men and possess a pronounced material aspect, wealth, numbers, lineage, marriages, dowries, and so on, are precisely the values competition for which must breed envy in those who are not successful.

The root of the involvement of the Sarakatsani in these 771
dramatic happenings lies in the simple belief constantly re- 776
iterated, especially by the women on the Friday, that 'he died 796
for us'. They identify themselves with the sufferings of Christ because He has identified Himself with them. In becoming a man like themselves He asserted the essential nobility of man. In His death, His blood effected a union between man and God which overcame the separating barrier of ancestral sin. His resurrection has for the Sarakatsani the paradoxical significance that He lives to die again; for, particularly in the events of the Great Week each year, and more generally in the sacrament of the Eucharist, He continually performs the miracle anew. In the cry, 'Christ is risen', is the knowledge that His liberating blood will always be at hand to save men from abandonment to the Devil.

The role of Christ in this situation, like those of the Mother of God and the Saints in the everyday cult, is that of intercessor. But in this instance the act is on the cosmic scale, not merely a partial and external relationship effected by a Saint between a particular individual and God. It is the reconciliation of all men to God and to one another. The fitness of Christ for this role lies in his origin from God the Father on the one hand and His human mother on the other. 'He was a man, then, like us' it is said both in folk tales and in comment upon the events of His life. From His mother the divine Son of God took on a condition in all respects like that of man, except that through His virgin birth he remained outside sin. Born of a virgin, a virgin in His life, it needed the sacrifice of a Being, divine, human, exposed to sin yet untouched by it, to bring man and God together.

The Sarakatsani understand well the efficacy of virginity. It 831
is a condition which, temporarily at least, defies the corruption 577
of age and death. As it has been suggested in the discussion of 884
prestige values, the time of moral excellence in a man's life is the period of youthful manhood before his marriage, when he is free to live by the ideal standards of honour and when, also, he is ignorant of the sexuality of woman which is one consequence, in a world of sin, of the division of humanity into two sexes. As the virginity of the Sarakatsan youth or maiden is a partial and individual attempt to deny the consequences of [771]

577 771 sexuality, so the virginity of Christ suppresses in His person this fundamental division of humanity.

771 783 772 But men are also divided from God and from one another by their mutual envy. This disunion is a more subtle form of corruption which few men attempt or are able to resist. It requires the sacrifice of Christ's blood to redeem this condition and to establish, even briefly, the ideal of the brotherhood of men that makes possible a full communion between man and God. That in their own social experience only an unmarried brother would make this sacrifice of life and blood confirms in the minds of the Sarakatsani the role of Christ as the archetypal brother, in a transcendent sibling relationship where only identification, and never rivalry, finds a place.

571 574 771 781 796 The idea of Christ's brotherhood implies, at least, the brotherhood of the Sarakatsani of Zagori, and by extension (though less certainly) the brotherhood of Orthodox Greeks. Christ sacrificed Himself not for one but for all. Not the least miracle of Easter is the measure of social goodwill. There is an easy warmth of greeting and attitude between unrelated men which is entirely foreign to the tense aggressiveness that is the formal idiom of social life at other times. On Easter Monday each family visits, and is visited by, all the Sarakatsan families who live within easy walking distance, whether they are kinsmen or not. Except at the summer festival celebrated by each family (very often the feast of the Assumption) this is probably the only occasion during the year that a man penetrates into the home and receives the hospitality of another unrelated shepherd. On the Saturday of Easter instead of delivering their milk to the cheese merchant the Sarakatsani give it away to villagers or the poorer families of their own community. These simple gestures that might be unexceptional in other communities are an impressive reversal of normal attitudes. The union of men in Christ is reflected at the level of social relations in an expression of ideal solidarity which for a moment breaks down the barriers which isolate family from 829 family and community from community. At other times, the notion that all the ills of the world derive from the view that every man is concerned only for his own family is constantly asserted, and as often deplored. There is always a yearning for unity and goodwill in the community, but it is a yearning accompanied by the knowledge that it can never be.

Zagori

families live for the last few days on vegetable soup, beans, and 796
coffee. For this week, at least, the ancestral sins of sensuality 785
and envy must be suppressed. The community becomes conti- 771 [262]
nent and unrelated men behave towards one another with
unaccustomed warmth and goodwill. A man must truly repent 796
his personal sins. Whenever a confessor is within reach, he 783
ought to make a confession of his sins before taking communion. 771
He must approach God with a 'good heart'. In these ways a man to a degree, loosens the hold which material things and the senses hold over him and, in some measure, is purified so that he may receive into himself the divine element. The Sarakatsanos believes that if he is properly prepared ritually and spiritually to receive the sacrament, then his sins are forgiven. The wine he drinks is indeed the blood of Christ (the body is seldom mentioned) and it is considered a sin if any man suffers a fit of vomiting in the 40 days which immediately follow communion. It is also described as a remembrance (ἐνθύμιον) of Christ. Thus the wine is at one and the same time a symbol of the first sacrifice and a material substance in which divine energy exists. It represents, and it is, the blood of Christ.

4. SOCIAL VALUES AND RELIGIOUS IDEALS

At the risk of some repetition, the problem of the opposition 182
of two systems of values, one social the other religious, has yet 577
to be explicitly considered. This community of Sarakatsani, 771
whose coherent and distinctive traditions suggest, in the absence [174]
of any certain historical proofs, that it may have existed since, at least, the late Byzantine period, possesses a body of social values based upon a number of simple and unambiguous concepts of honour, strength, prestige and pride. And in the previous chapter I have emphasized the exclusive and particularist form of these social ideals. Yet throughout this period [279]
the community has belonged to an Orthodox Christian civilization. Allowing for its primitive material culture and geogra- [172]
phical isolation, it has clearly been profoundly influenced by this wider membership as, for instance, even a cursory examination of Sarakatsan wood-carving immediately suggests. Although it is true that the relationship of the Sarakatsani to the Orthodox Church, as an institution, has been sufficiently tenuous to result in a popular religious life that is a gross

Zagori

182 refraction of Orthodox dogma and practice, yet the value of
577 the Christian ideal of the fellowship of all men in Christ, with
771 the universalistic ethical values that follow from it, is not to be
avoided. How is this opposition of values resolved or accommodated?

182 There is no great problem of fellowship between Sarakatsani
577 who are related by kinship or marriage. By associating The
771 Father, The Son, and the Mother of God in a Holy archetype
602 Family, the institutions and relationships of the Sarakatsan
family, even the concept of honour and the duty to defend it, are given a categorical quality and a divine sanction; and by extension kindred and affinal bonds receive a similar validation. It is true that even within this restricted circle certain Christian values cannot enjoy a general application. Modesty, meekness, humility are values only admirable in women. Some Christian prescriptions have to be entirely set aside. One cannot forgive a kinsman who has betrayed his trust, at least
[235] not until he is dead. And one avoids the company of a kinsman
who is despised for his poverty; the poor are not blessed. Yet love (ἀγάπη), mutual trust, truth, and altruism are important Christian virtues which are the ideal values of family and kinship life. Men would extend the circle of their application if they could, but the conditions of life in a fallen world prevent this, particularly limited resources, the divinely sanctioned honour and interests of a man's own family, the condition of envy.

182 Yet in their commitment to the concept of honour as the
577 guiding principle of behaviour, the Sarakatsani cannot admit
771 themselves to be anything but noble; and this must be said not
783 only of the soul but the body also, for honour is related to
828 physical strength and manliness when this is disciplined and
spiritualized. The original guilt for sin must be placed elsewhere. This is the role of the Devil. Sensuality was the sin of Adam but only after the sin had been thought of and presented to him by the Devil with the assistance of woman. Envy, the more fundamental sin, was originally the cause of the Devil's rebellion against God. 'The Devil envied God' (ὁ διάβολος ζήλεψε τὸν Θεό), the Sarakatsani say. In this way the Sarakatsani avoid personal guilt for their own implication in these sins. Even in the case of personal sins for which individual

guilt is admitted, Sarakatsani would say that the fault of the 182
man was in the act of turning away from God, not in the sin 577
itself. For without the grace of God he cannot resist the Devil 771
who then leads his victim to the sin he has chosen for him. 783
828

However, just as children inherit responsibility for the sins of their parents, the responsibility for the sins of Adam cannot be avoided. The condition of sin in which a man lives, although it is exterior to his individual will, interrupts his communion with God on which life and honour depend. It is in this situation that Christ comes to save men, pouring out the sacrifice of his blood to reunite man with God, a salvation, however, which is contingent on man freely turning from the Devil towards God. In a certain sense, then, these forms of sin are a kind of pollution, for which the Devil is originally guilty and responsible, and from which Christ is the saviour. But this analogy must not be pressed too far. This salvation requires moral action on the side of man. In his daily life he must struggle to discipline sensuality and he must avoid the ultimate consequences of envy. For, the fact that all earthly families are imperfect copies of a divine archetype places a limit on the amoral ruthlessness that unrelated men may show towards one another in circumstances where such conduct seriously and unnecessarily endangers the existence of another family. And at certain periods of religious celebration, such as Christmas, Easter, and the feast of Assumption, the sins of Adam must be altogether suppressed through universal continence, goodwill, and the symbolic sharing of food.

Although it is clear that the values of honour are not what 182
they are for any influence of Christian ideals, it would be 577
wrong to suggest, as it has sometimes been said, that Christianity 771
is almost entirely external to Sarakatsan life. Not only are the Sarakatsani deeply conscious of their total dependence on God, whether in the person of The Father or The Saviour, but the family is seen as an image of the Holy Family, and Christian values are the basis of relationships between kinsmen and affines, the people with whom, after all, a man lives and works. And at religious festivals men succeed, momentarily, in living
the ideal of a universal brotherhood in Christ. And although, [156]
in the periods of profane living which separate these moments of transcendence, men must admire the shrewd and scheming

182
577 leader and accept the need for lies and deceit, the ideal social
771 personality remains the unmarried pallikari, the 'innocent'
156 (ἀθῶος), alone with his sheep, not yet fully implicated in the
ancestral sins of sensuality and envy.

182 These beliefs indicate, clearly enough, that the Sarakatsani
578 sense that all is not right with their world, a sentiment that is
776 Christian not heroic. When men quarrel and draw their knives,
771 an event that is the breath of life in an heroic culture, the
Sarakatsani say, 'The Devil is dancing in the middle' (χορεύει ὁ διάβολος μέσα). Indeed the Devil is the symbol and the efficient cause of all those many tensions and hostilities which prevent the Sarakatsani from living in the values of Christian fellowship. Not only is he the original cause of the miasma of ancestral sin, the provoker of the evil eye and the tempter to sexual lusts, but in his desire to injure physically where he cannot corrupt morally, his action on the spiritual plane parallels the mutual hostilities and social isolation which each family experiences in social life.

182 When all this is said there remains an opposition between
577 Christian ideals and the values of prestige. Fortunately or
771 otherwise, the Sarakatsani do not see this; partly because the
829 two value systems either appear to be complementary as in
family or kindred, or in other areas of social life they are relatively segregated in their incidence; and partly because the individual thinking in egocentric terms cannot see that his own honour, prestige, pride, and self-regard threaten another. It is always the other man, and, behind, the Devil moving and manipulating him, who corrupt society and provoke the anger of God.

/92 cont./

232 which permits him to reach the brain and the cyst. With a hook
[413] (small elongated implement ending in a kind of hook) he removes
[237] the cyst, replaces the bone, covers the spot of entry with beeswax and applies a dressing. After several days the wound heels and the animal recovers.

The safety of the livestock

233 The serious enemies of the flocks are wild beasts (chiefly wolves),
[685] on the one hand, and livestock thieves on the other. (A short time
[577] ago, the latter were very numerous, this type of theft being considered a virtue among herders. Against them Sarakatsani keep large dogs,
[231] very savage and very dangerous. These dogs do not hesitate to grapple with wolves, and it is for this reason that their masters put around their necks a collar studded with iron points.

Moreover, the shepherds always see to it that the flock /93/ does not disperse, for the strayed animals become the specific prey of wolves and thieves. This task is easier when there is a ram or a buck in the flock, since these animals act as the center of attraction for the livestock (ewes and she-goats). Moreover, the sound of their
[534] bells (they are huge, some weighing several kilograms) always gives the signal for reassembly of the flock by a conditioned reflex mechanism. This mechanism is so effective that even in the darkest nights the shepherds succeed in regrouping their animals by ringing these bells. /Fig. 74 appears here/

221 Seasonal migrations

233 The seasonal migrations involve the following arrangements:

484 At a designated hour, always before dawn, the women set to work;
361 entrusted with the preparations, they gather up the equipment and load
[462] it on the backs of the beasts of burden. The men, for their part, "take care of the livestock." When everything is ready, human beings, beasts of burden and flock form a column in the order laid down by tradition. The flocks surrounded by shepherds and dogs set out first.

/140 cont./

585
602 The wife is solemnly presented "to the city and the world,"
848 surrounded and chaperoned by her new lineage, in such a way that
562 everybody knows that she belongs to this lineage and that her
613 descendants are now and henceforward known by it as legitimate.

585 /141/ However, since certain points here may still be obscure,
602 let us continue our analysis:

[591] Secondly, the young couple, as we have also seen, settles down in
the hut where the paternal family of the husband lives. In view of
[342] the fact that Sarakatsani huts are not partitioned and that everybody
sleeps on the floor around the hearth, it is easy to understand that
the wedding night is spent--in the midst of the family!

585 In order to justify this practice, the Sarakatsani say that "the
833 sexual act between the spouses should be carried out in the bosom of the
602 family." Moreover, the same holds true for all the couples in the
family.

The Sarakatsani reply to the astonished investigator "that the newly married couple do not wear bells" that therefore this act occurs unperceived by the others...However, that is the anecdotal aspect of the matter.

● 577 To suppress the barriers of modesty, above all within the framework
834 of this society where morals are very strict, where bold allusions,
831 especially in front of women, are forbidden, (21)
where one never even speaks of the sexual life (the account of magic rites in connection with fertility will furnish an illustration of this), is not a simple and easy act.

21. We ourselves were present at the following scene:
One evening, the old head of the family, warmed by wine,
[593] started to tell a bawdy story. Whereupon his sons,
despite the respect they owed him, protested to such an
extent that the old man fell silent.

/218 cont./

627 682 33. The same idea is to be found in antiquity: G. Glotz: La solidarité, p. 47-48.

[602] [581] Thus, there is no contradiction between the vendetta and the pro-
[182] hibition of homicide. If the execution of the murderer is avenged in turn
627 that is because another principle comes into play, that of safeguarding
628 682 at all costs the moral and social integrity of the family. The necessity
182 to abide by this principle is so over whelming that the prohibition of
homicide yields to it in the end.

It is true that this arrangement is not the most fortunate. However, it reflects very well the relations between the individual and /219/ the group, or rather the individual and the family, the choice in the final analysis being in favor of the group.

Moreover, there is no reason to assume that the vendetta presupposes a collective responsibility of the family groups in case of homicide: first, because they usually seek to kill the murderer himself; second, if they kill instead one of his close relatives, which is not unusual, this is not because they consider him co-responsible, but in order to weaken the family. That is why, furthermore they then choose the best, the most distinguished, the strongest.

As to the application of the vendetta, there is no procedure provided to judge the affair and to pronounce a verdict. Custom, known beforehand by all, is followed.

[562] Carrying out the vendetta is the responsibility chiefly of the young men of the family. The women are excluded from it both as victims and executers.

Sentimental and sexual relations outside marriage.

837 181 577 Sarakatsani society disapproves strongly of sentimental and sexual relations outside marriage.

A statement based on Sarakatsani ideology is very indicative in this respect. According to it, cases of this kind never occur among them, as

837 /219 cont./
181 though their nature in this respect were different from that of other
577 human beings. Yet it must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that such relations
are extremely rare.

577 The woman, young girl or wife, who carries on illicit relations risks
837 being put to death either by her relatives or by her husband and the
684 latter's relatives. Though marriage with the partner might possibly, if
627 rarely, let the girl escape punishment, an adulterous woman is invariably
602 punished.

Her lover too is exposed to the same punishment, the carrying out of which is incumbent on the relatives of the woman.

The Sarakatsani maintain that the justification for this severe punishment lies in the fact that the act of the woman (young girl or wife) dishonors her family or her husband and his relatives, and that only blood can wash away the stain.

Moreover, this conviction is not peculiar to our herders; one finds
[191] it all over Greece. In our opinion this is an /220/ ideological sublimation
[182] of two principles: that of the societal control of individuals with regard
[848] to marriage, and that of the control of the legitimacy of descent, of which
we have spoken above.

837 Observation shows that this belief in "wounded honor" as well as the
577 drama that it provokes recede and diminish to the extent the children, the
562 girls above all, free themselves from paternal and family authority in the
[593] [584] matter of marriage and marry according to their own choice.

If a lover is not punished by his own relatives for his illegitimate
[684] acts it is because, in a system dominated by pronounced patriarchy, the man
is a privileged being to whom everything is permitted--a version obviously
not acceptable to the relatives of the woman who accuse him of having
ruined her.

[626] However, in such a case, the comments, regardless of who makes them,
are much more severe towards the woman than towards her accomplice who

837 /220 cont./
577 562 "in the end is a man and is only seeking his pleasure."

626 Rape and abduction of a young girl.

684 These two acts are also punished with death by the relatives of the victim. But they too are extremely rare.

583 684 627 [584] The kidnapping, the abduction of a young girl usually is a form of vengeance. It happens that a suitor whose proposals have been evaded by the relatives of the young girl avenges himself by carrying her off forcibly with the help of his friends.

However, if the abductor then does not consent to marry her the men of the victim's family have the duty to kill him. The justification for the punishment resides in the principles which have been set forth above.

685 The theft of animals.

[674] [673] This act is either a crime or an exploit according to circumstances.

If the thief is caught in the act he is killed on the spot by the shepherds watching their flocks. If he is identified after the deed he must give up the stolen animals in order to acquit hemself. If he refuses, he risks being either killed by the injured shepherds or of being deprived of part of his flock in retaliation.

685 555 577 /221/ However, an animal thief not caught is the subject of admiration by all, even his victims. For it is not easy to carry off his exploit. In order to manage it, the thief must crawl and climb, without noise in the dark of night without a moon, across gorges and rocks, elude the watch of armed shepherds, escape the scent of the terrible dogs capable of tearing him to shreds in an instant, carry off the sheep without having them bleat of sound their bells, and disappear with them silently into the night.

685 577 On the other hand, to steal animals in a fixed sheepfold of the winter camp is a shameful act that brings disgrace to the one guilty of it.

685 577 Finally, this code, so to speak, regarding animal theft implies another rule:

783 The thief unidentified and therefore unpunished is in any case

/221 cont./

685 responsible to God for the sin which he has committed. In order to be
577 absolved he must later confess his sin publicly "during a drinking bout
783 among pals or during the shearing." His account testifies at one and the
[784] same time to his pride in the accomplished prowess and to his belief in
punishment inflicted by the Supreme Judge, the remission of which is dependent
on this which unfortunately we cannot go into more deeply for lack
685 of data. This aspect is encountered again in another case: that of the
577 destruction of a beehive. That act is considered criminal for, through
825 it, "one kills many souls" (the souls of the bees) and deprives the
[674] [774] Church of the wax that the bees could produce.

This way of adjusting the punishment to the circumstances merits
685 our attention. For it shows us how Sarakatsani society conceives of justice
577 and reparation in these specific instances.

By shooting at the thief they are merely defending their property
[625] and possible their lives. Any recourse to protection from the police is not possible to those who live in the mountains and on the edge of a hostile and indifferent state; so there is nothing left for them but to shoot at the one who threatens (and in any case with an armed hand) to deprive them of their means of subsistence and possibly their lives.

/222/ If, after the theft, they are content to demand restitution of the animals carried off or simply to retaliate in order to be compensated, that is because there is no longer any question of defense, and all that is involved is compensation for the damage caused. If the culprit does not want to conform, his refusal is merely a further challenge, a new wound to the pride of the robbed owner; and it is in response to this humiliation that the latter seeks to kill the thief. If he does not do so he will be dishonored in the eyes of his associates.

Finally, the pride of the unpunished thief and the admiration of the
[555] others for his prowess are very understandable. Among a people who live
in difficult and always dangerous conditions, courage and skill, even when
[783] directed toward evil, inspire respect. However, the public confession
shows that the bravery does not gainsay the illegal character of this act.

/235 cont./

671 of P. Radin. (44)

44. P. Radin: Le monde de l'homme primitif, p. 221 f.

671 681 182 [627] /236/ Its sanctions guarantee its functions, at once distributive, preventive, restitutive, repressive. They are not taken from the law of retaliation, as the instance of the vendetta particularly demonstrates. They are based on the idea of the defense of the social equilibrium or its reestablishment if it is temporarily disrupted.

Thanks to the mechanism of disguised coercion, it acquires, citing the expression of Mauss, (45)

45. Manuel, p. 110.

a character of strongly felt intimacy and community, for it can become involved at any moment in the smallest details of the life of our herders.

671 182 Seemingly simple, if not simplistic, but basically very complex, Sarakatsani law meets the need for social control with extreme efficacy, which one would not dispute if one looked closely at its social context. For the dynamics of Sarakatsani law, transmitted in the social framework to a large extent give it its stability.

/237/

CHAPTER IV

MORAL PHENOMENA AND MORALITY AMONG THE SARAKATSANI

577 121 Morality among the Sarakatsani is neither systematized nor doctrinal. It is bound up with many aspects of their lives, in symbols, attitudes, conduct, habits, customs, language, cultural works, all of which serve as its vehicles. (1)

1. This phenomenon is not peculiar to the Sarakatsani alone. See A. Bayet: La science des faits moeurs, p. 17.

In attempting to recognize it and make it clear, the problem of an operational criterion of procedure arises. "In order to observe the moral phenomenon, one must also know what characterizes it, by what distinctive mark it can be recognized," Durkheim (2)

/237 cont./

577 121 2. Definition of the moral phenomenon in Sociology et Philosophie /Sociology and Philosophy/, p. 49 f.

said, emphasizing the methodological prerequisite necessary for any study of moral phenomena.

Now if it is true that morality is a sum total of ideas by which behavior must be prompted, if these ideas represent values, and if behavior which does not conform to them is socially disapproved, /then/ these assertions, expressed concretely in terms of Sarakatsani reality, are sufficient to guide our research. They must also determine the outline of this chapter.

* * * *

577 The fundamental values of Sarakatsani morality are the family, chastity, the "community," tradition, finally insubordination.

The analysis of the aspects of their lives that we have studied up
to now testifies to this. Everything that has to do with the family
(descent, relations of all kinds between its members, including economic
577 relations) is intimately bound up with morality. /238/ Chastity involves
831 the control of sexuality in its known forms, the prohibition of adultery,
the guarantee of the legitimacy of descendants, the virginity requirement and
very strict morals imposed on young girls. Although this subject is
connected with the family, we shall emphasize it particularly, in view of
its importance for the Sarakatsani. When they speak of morality they are
(884) referring to sexual life. Moreover, an assault against decency and virtue
is considered by them as more grave morally than an attack on a person's
life. If a woman is sexually abused, the infamy falls on all the members of
her family whose honor is thereafter tarnished. Honor and sexuality go
(171) together among our herders, as they do, in fact, in all of Greece. In the
(195) context of the same ideas, discussion and allusions relating to sexuality
are systematically avoided, although frank speech is common among persons
(834) (888) (604) of the same age and the same sex. But it is necessary to be reserved toward

577 /238 cont./
833 elders, the opposite sex and strangers. Let us recall in this connection
834 that the separation of the sexes is still manifest in the custom that
888 (609) requires men and women to dance separately at festivals.
(535) As for the "community," everyone must consider that his life belongs
621 to the service of others, hence the obligation of solidarity and cooperation
577 on all levels. Conversely and consequently, distrust of non-Sarakatsani is
(609) (574) obligatory, though the rules of hospitality are not violated.

577 As far as tradition is concerned, there is nothing to add to what has
been said up to now. Finally, with respect to courage and bravery, indispensable qualities for people whose hard life is carried on in isolation,
it is necessary to point out that this subject is also bound up with
577 patriotism. At the birth of each boy it is customary for relatives and
579 friends to wish the parents of the newborn child: "That he will one day
(576) become a resistance fighter /maquisard/ and the head of a band." (3)

3. Reported by B. Skafidas: Ibid., p.57.

[648] This wish has a definite meaning: it expressed the desire that the newborn
child, once he becomes an adult, will participate actively in revolts
against the Turks and that he will even distinguish himself as chief of the
rebels. However, because of the fact that some Sarakatsani have practiced
brigandage the impression arose that this aspiration tended to lean to
577 banditry. In /239/ this impression, obviously erroneous, one might
579 recognize the phenomenon of an "out group" /cited in English/; (4)

114 648 (113) 4. See W.G. Sumner: Folkways, A study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores and morals /cited in English/, 1906.--T. Newcomb: Social Psychology /cited in English/, London, 1955.

the surrounding society is always ready to accuse the Sarakatsani of acts
577 579 it disapproves. (5) If some of them have actually practiced brigandage, we

/239 cont./

577 579 5. This opinion is also shared by B. Skafidas: Ibid., p. 61 f. who, referring to some cases of banditry by the Sarakatsani, is largely generalizing. There are evil-doers everywhere. must agree that they are an exception. Their morality positively excludes it.

577 Having identified their principal values, we now understand that almost all of Sarakatsani life is imbued with morality and that it is almost always present, as is proper to types of social life that have not yet been depersonalized, but are based on direct, non-mechanical relations and have preserved their entire human depth.

* * *

Nevertheless, the aspect of moral life that we have just examined does not determine solely and in the final analysis what one must do in daily life, but also what one ought to become, the moral qualities that each Sarakatsani must acquire and with which he must build up his own personality. The values described suggest a model that each man, woman and child must follow and carry out by conforming to it as much as possible. The components of this model we already know, but in different contexts. We must therefore try to synthesize them in a few words and into a coherent picture, despite the risk of repetition.

The Sarakatsani must be temperate, chaste and reserved in his acts, his manners, his language; respectful of the social hierarchy and the discipline prescribed in the rules by which his social life functions; dilligent in the obligations and the exercise of rights related to his role and his social status; he must conform to the prescriptions of tradition to the point of rigidity.

In particular, in order to measure up to his duties, the head of a family or of the Tséligato must show prudence and foresight, action and application in the management of common interests. /240/ As administrator he must show competence, generosity and justice; and as manager and as a

/240 cont./

577 "link with the outside," experience, skill and "sociability" are demanded of him.

As for the groups or group-agents of morality, they are expected to show a restraint in their behavior clearly similar to that indicated for individuals.

* * * *

577 181 The chief observation that may be made on the basis of these cursory statements on the values and moral qualities of the Sarakatsani is that their morality is highly social, and that for two reasons: first, because they spring from collective ideas; second, because they aim essentially at "the common good."

On the first point no comment is necessary in view of the sole and supreme authority of tradition--a collective entity--over values and moral qualitites.

As for the second point, one need only consider each of the fundamental values, their content and objective, in order to be convinced that they correspond only to collective needs and assumptions.

If individuals benefit and if they develop their moral personalities from these values that is merely a parallel consequence. They perfect themselves morally by practicing morality. (6)

6. An analogous assertion is found in Fr. Rauh: L'expérience morale, p. 71, who, citing the formula or Renouvier "to do and by doing become" applied to science, notes that it is also true of morals.

577 182 However, Sarakatsani morality does not aim directly at the moral elevation of individuals. It is concerned chiefly with controlling Sarakatsani society within the limits of its possibilities with moving it toward structuralization.

The functional correlations between this morality, on the one hand, and the family framework, the socio-economic organization and conditions of

/240 cont./

577 [182] Sarakatsani life, on the other, thus appear clearly--the first depending on the second and the second finding considerable support in the first.

* * * *

/241/ These reflections open the way to the study of another problem, that of the process through which morality actually controls the life of individuals and groups.

Observation shows that their morality is strong. It is the result,
[867] first of all, of the moral education of individuals, which commences at a tender age and is carried out chiefly by the extended family, as we know. Next, come the example and the putting forward by society of what G. Gurvitch calls "ideal symbolic images," (7) which hold a special attraction for men and which correspond to models presented by a good headman, a good father and mother, a good shepherd, a brave Sarakatsani, etc., or by a truly communal family, by the perfect Tséligato--goals toward which every human act must constantly lead. But
[626] there is more. It is the mechanism of approbation or of censure proper to morality which is supported by the direct control of behavior (particularly intense in groups such as this whose range is limited) and which expresses itself in valuation of concrete behavior, presupposing the idea of "honor" as the Saraktsani conceive it.

This particular point merits attention. For it is through the idea of honor and the conditions according to which "a man is honorable or not" that one can: 1st, show the margin that Sarakatsani society leaves to individuals to exercise choice in favor of this or that orientation of their action (which constitutes the essence of the moral phenomenon); 2nd, determine the line of demarcation separating morality from law; 3rd, discover the hierarchical relationship of these two types of social regulation in relation to one another.

---

7. See G. Gurvitch: "Sociologie de la vie morale" in _Traité_ vol. II, p. 152.

/241 cont./

577 Now the idea of "honor" depends upon the moral requirements that Saraktsani society imposes on its members. These may be grouped under two headings: minor moral requirements and major moral requirements.

Under the heading "minor requirements" we include every case in which a comparative conformity of individuals or groups to rules, norms, moral propositions, etc., is tolerated. In all these instances the persons involved may conform to norms closely or less closely without dishonor. If a person /242/ succeeds only more or less in embodying the ideal symbolic image presented to each according to his condition, his status, his role, if a person does not succeed in reaching perfection in commercial, economic, or administrative skill (8) (provided he is not a Tséligas), if he is not capable of becoming a "rebel leader" or an "animal thief," etc., he is not dishonored, but merely not honored, not distinguished in the crowd. On the other hand, a person is dishonored if he makes no effort to practice "comparative" conformity, if he does not embody this "moral minimum," in other words, if he falls into complete amorality. Sarakatsani society has no room for amorality.

577
156

8. Underneath these attributes one finds a "morality of usefulness" according to the terminology of G. Gurvitch, the existence of which is attested by a consideration of the honor those enjoy who achieve it: Ibid., p. 149.

Dishonor also falls on the one who goes outside the fundamental rules of Saraktsani life. These are the major moral requirements that no one, under any pretext, has the right to transgress. Individuals and groups are inevitably dishonored if they do not conform to the rules pertaining to the creation and functioning of the family, the rules of chastity, of solidarity, of upholding tradition, etc. In all these instances such persons are exposed to general contempt.

However, the one who comes as close as possible tothe ideal symbolic image corresponding to the situation and who conforms strictly to the major moral requirements is honored by all.

/242 cont./

577 The Sarakatsani may therefore take his choice between non-distinction, dishonor and honor. These are the limits within which he may deploy his moral activity.

577 These alternatives have their justification in the risks that one
156 runs socially by the choice one makes. By choosing non-distinction the subject injures only himself. By opting for infamy (though this may seem paradoxical), that is to say, by violating fundamental rules or denying the "minimum morality," the individual or the group endanger the collectivity which then would react against them with severity. By prefering honor one becomes a pillar of social life, for, thanks to the conduct and example one offers to all, one contributes to its solidity. Honor is the reward to those who have embodied Sarakatsani morality. They become "morality in person."

577 /243/ As for the line of demarcation separating morality from law, the
671 foregoing remarks show that the major requirements constitute the common
681 threshold. It is in terms of the importance of the infraction committed, therefore the importance of the risks run by non-conformity, that the foregoing passage, analyzed from the standpoint of legal reactions will be understood, and that the mechanism of sanction and coercion is activated.
(626) Thus, the major moral requirements and law may intermingle, the difference residing in the concrete fact of the intensity of social repression: either society is content simply to scorn the culprit or it decides to react more violently.

577 It follows that morality, as social control, occupies a prominent place
626 among the Sarakatsani, though it cannot be placed above the law. Despite
671 its rigidity, especially with reference to major requirements, it comes after law, though it complements and aids the latter by its own prestige.

577 The regulation of the actions of these herders, tough, intrepid, indepen-
181 dent human beings, true fighters ceaselessly striving to conquer innumerable
671 difficulties and obstacles, requires means more powerful than morals, hence

/243 cont./

577 [181] [671] [114] law, the supremacy of which one cannot deny. (9) clearly, the morality of the Sarakatsani is nowhere in contradiction with their other social regulations, with the rules deriving from religion, magic, knowledge etc., and as a result it never creates problems of conscience or behavior, nor [182] of internal social rupture. On the contrary, being perfectly integrated in a perfectly coherent system, it offers the Sarakatsani a solid as well as an indispensable foundation for safeguarding their traditional social life.

/244/

PART THREE

121 /245/IN THE PRESENCE OF THE MYSTERIOUS, THE WONDERFUL, THE BEAUTIFUL

/245/ "In vain, experience says 'it is false' and reason says 'it is absurd,' humanity clings all the more to absurdity and error."

This phrase by Henri Bergson (1) could serve as the motto for the title of this section if the point of view proper to anthropology did not impose on us the duty not to criticize but to explain "the absurd" and "the error," to recognize them as stages through which humanity passes in its epic course toward the conquest of the world by the mind. (2)

128 In this third part we shall try to study in detail how the Sarakatsani,

---

9. G. Gurvitch: Ibid., p. 199, states an opposite opinion not, it is true, with regard to the Sarakatsani but in relation to patriarchal structure in general. It is difficult for us to accept this opinion based on the consideration that Hebraic society of biblical times, Homeric society, the latifundia, the zadruga etc., are ruled by morality. It seems to us that Deutoronomy, the scene of the chaining of Achilles, the very ancient Roman law, etc., as well as the type of life of these societies shows the opposite.

1. See Les Deux Sources, p. 105.

2. See above, Chapter III.

182
291 /382 cont./
261 in family or society symbolic ornaments bringing about fecundity among
181 women).

182
671 Nevertheless, every economico-social system has need of another system of rules which will socially guarantee the first. The Sarakatsani thus introduce their law first of all, based on custom, equity and common sense, which means that this law, along with crystallized rules, includes spontaneous and ad hoc prescriptions. It sanctions the fundamental organizing rules of their life and the functioning of their social and economic institutions which it makes their own. Its salient characteristic is to favor cooperation and its results, and to combat individualism.
182 Its chief concern is to protect kinship and herding by its penal provisions;
671 that is why it does not hesitate to threaten miscreants with capital
681 punishment (the vendetta, for example). In any case, and in order to impose itself, it introduces a mechanism of ajudication, of sanction and coercion, sometimes not apparent, which are in keeping with isolation (not to resort to the justice of "the foreigner") and to the necessity of showing itself effective, though there does not exist among them a specific legal
[626] apparatus. The principle of conformity finds its best means of expression here, while enforcing the mechanism in question. On the other hand,
182 morality, by its mechanism of honor or dishonor maintains all the rules
577 enumerated, integrating them into its principal values such as tradition,
181 family, chastity, community, bravery and independence, which basically represent merely the main ideas of Sarakatsani life elevated to the level of morality.

There is nothing astonishing in this state of affairs. The moment a society accepts and proposes a certain number of fundamental principles on which it bases its life, it is altogether normal that these principles be raised to moral values. The contrary would result in meaninglessness.

183 /399 cont./
578 In the second place, there is constraint in the general sense of
182 the term. It appears first in the influence of the Tséligas, the head,
626 who, to the extent that he has a strong personality and a true capacity
[474] to govern, is in a position to impose on his subjects the traditional
[554] norms by which the family group functions and thus to safeguard its
cohesion and its content /sic: "son conteny"/. Constraint manifests
[671] itself next in law and morality, the two aspects of group constraint
[577] which, armed with social support, act sovereignly in favor of the socio-
cultural status quo. The analysis of the way they are enforced has
demonstrated their effectiveness.

578 In the third place are the idealization and mythization of the
182 "Sarakatsani condition," the elevation to the rank of supreme value and
183 myth every cultural solution to each specific problem. No matter that
the application of these solutions, coldly considered, entails priva-
tions, concessions, and demands abnegation or sacrifice! In psychoanalytic
terms, one might call this phenomenon sublimation.

578 Religion for its part, with its teaching and traditions that
771 prescribe obedience to headmen, to elders, and justify the subordination
183 of the woman, while sanctioning the traditions by salvation, also supports
182 the social edifice by determining behavior and its motivation, that is
to say, by determining collective attitudes.

578 Finally, we encounter the mechanism of "obligation-compensation"
675 /400/ of which we have spoken above, (2)

182 2. See above, p. 205-206, etc.

and to which we should like to add some details--first of all terminolog-
[121] ically. The notion of alienation is taken here in its primitive and
legal meaning (Lalande) according to which alienatus is not free. Thus,
it is not identical with mental alienation or with alienation according